

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VII

JANUARY, 1907

NO. 7

First Impressions of Socialism Abroad.

No. 2. (At the Italian Congress.)

TWO weeks later I was in The Eternal City in the new and handsome Casa del Popola, the socialists' own meeting hall. The congress of the Italian Socialist Party was in session and every one was alive with excitement, as it had everywhere been rumored that the party would be split into a thousand fragments. The Reformists, led by their able and forceful Turati, the Syndicalists, led by their brilliant, emotional and impractical Labriola; and the Integralists, led by the impressive and not always consistent Ferri, — all were there and lost no time in giving battle.

It seemed natural in Rome to be seeing a battle of giants, a quarrelling, hero-worshipping mob behind each and the fate of one of the greatest and noblest nations of the world resting upon the outcome. And, as I sat three days in that hall, it seemed to me that this was not far from the actual situation. With all the lovable qualities, with a fine and sincere admiration for power and greatness, with a quick and agile intelligence, with childlike frankness and honesty, with idealism and splendid emotion, quick to resent, quick to forgive, these men sat together for three days backing their leaders like boys with fighting cocks, deciding so far as I could see nothing of importance (except not to split) but discussing almost everything in the wide world of interest. It was a thousand times more interesting than the German congress. It was comic, tragic, lyric and as thing to watch fascinating, but at the end no one seemed to have had his view altered.

The thing that most astonished me in my first view of the

Italian gathering was its middle class character. Not only were all the leaders intellectuals but they were not in any sense men of the working class. Even Labriola, who led the fight of the unions, and who bitterly attacked the intellectuals in the movement, is an intellectual and most conspicuously so. He is a professor in the University of Naples and has for many years been an advocate. The numerous stylishly dressed men gave me some doubts as to the sound foundations of the movement. Even in the reports of the Congress in Avanti, the official organ of the party, one sees after the names of certain speakers the word — *operaio* — workman! And it occurs with striking rareness. The feeling that there was something unsound in professional and comfortably well-off men talking, much of class-consciousness and advocating class war (in parliament) grew upon me and I have come away from Italy feeling that there must come some rather remarkable and revolutionary changes in the party itself before it becomes a socialist party.

And yet it may not be so. Certainly Italy is in a way the most democratic country in Europe and the people the most intelligent. In the midst of the most eruptive confusion they seem to get at the heart of things in a very striking way. The masses are by nature revolutionary and democratic and while they are poorly educated and rarely read they grasp the socialist ideal with surprising little loss of time. But so far as one can see they do not develop their own working-class leaders and that is perhaps their greatest weakness. For it is unquestionably true that while men of the exploiting and professional classes can be convinced of the necessity for socialism they can only most rarely appreciate the proletarian feeling or really sympathize with its inevitable and irresistible revolt. In other words they are likely to be unconsciously philosophic about its progress and willing to wait the long evolutionary process. This at any rate seems to be true of Italy, and their effort to throw on others the entire responsibility for the recent strikes shows that however good socialists they may be they are extremely fearful of all violence. But whether or not the movement in Italy is to continue indefinitely to be led by professionals and intellectuals, it is certain that for some time the workers have been chafing under the serene parliamentary methods of their middle class leaders.

In contrast to the German movement another thing is noticeable. The congress represented a battling of personalities, even more, it seemed to me, than a battling of ideas. To be sure each of the three "great men" represented a certain tendency but hero-worship and personal admiration swayed the judgements of the congressists almost as much as the tendencies to which they adhered. It seemed at times like a good old democratic party convention. The leaders might almost have been William

R., William J. and Grover. I can't think that the difference between the principles of these men was so important to the audience as their personalities. At any rate it seemed to me a fair inference if not quite just when an opposition paper put the tendencies of the party as Turatist, Ferrist and Labriolist. But this criticism is not the whole truth. There are tendencies represented by these men, or rather there are two tendencies, as the Integralists represent in part one tendency and in part the other. There is first the reformist. Without agreeing to all that their enemies say about them they are frankly and openly little more than Fabians. I think they are fearful of both the proletarian feeling and thought. Their main effort is directed toward obtaining certain reforms and the amelioration of the condition of the masses. Turati honestly and bravely stated the difference between his faction and that of the Syndicalists. "The conflict is not only a question of etiquette, it is at the same time in ideas, in sentiments, in action. Between the Bourgeois parties and the reformists, there is not a hostility so great or so violent as that which separates us from the Syndicalists, in spite of the soft lie of sweet fraternity in our party." This is certainly meant to be unequivocal and it is. Turati thinks the Syndicalists are Anarchists, at least in tendency, and he expresses himself with his admirable and characteristic frankness. I was forced to admire Turati, as many are who differ strongly with him in opinion. He is the ablest man among the members of the Party because he has the clearest and most logical mind. He is a keen and powerful debater and makes no effort, as the others do, to leave the field of pure and careful reasoning. He apparently has no desire to sway the emotions and his ability in critical and logical debate is, although used for a different tactic, similar in quality to that of Bebel or Jules Guesde. He is an incorrigible reformist, an impossibilist possibilist. In other words he is a logical and perfectly consistent reformist and arguing from that basis he is clear, consistent and courageous. Even his enemies, even those who have the feeling that he should leave the Party or be expelled can not fail to admire the consistent, brave, and masterly way in which he expresses and practices his views. But his views are those of John Burns and of Millerand; at least from the socialist point of view, one must so consider them, and if the socialist party was as clearly and uncompromisingly socialist in Italy as it is in France or even in England Turati would be faced with the same situation that confront, in these countries, men of the Millerand and Burns type.

Ferri is almost an exact counterpart of Turati. He is an emotional and powerful orator of the ordinary type. He is a man of good phrases, of epigrams and generalities. He is eclectic and a harmonizer, regardless of violent contradictions. He

considers that the socialist parties must everywhere have their advanced revolutionary tendencies, as expressed by the Syndicalists and their slow moving, timid and compromising tendencies as expressed by the reformist. In other words the party must always have, in the parliamentary phrase, a left wing and a right. It is the purpose of the Integralists to sit in the center and to harmonize the two extremes. Any one can see what a difficult position this is to fill and Ferri is attacked by both extremes for holding this middle ground and for his unwillingness to support the logic of the Syndicalists or the logic of the Reformists. Labriola thinks Integralism only a veil for those who are secretly reformists and Turati is impatient with it for not supporting the reformist position thus enabling the reformists to adopt a consistent reform program upon which to stand before the country and upon which they can fight in union in Parliament.

Opposed to both the reformist and the integralist is the Syndicalist. What his exact views are it was impossible to gather from the congressional proceedings. He was not there to any extent in person and I must think that the views that Labriola gave as the views of his faction, were only his own served up as Syndicalism. With a brilliancy not exceeded, with a handling of facts and theories that was truly remarkable, and with fearlessness and power, this very extraordinary young man presented his case. It created a tremendous sensation and as it was he who forced the fighting during the entire congress, it is only just that I should speak at greater length of his personality and views, although I am bound to think that the enthusiasm which he evoked was not so much because of his thought as because of the revolutionary spirit and the superb feeling that characterized his addresses.

It may be that Arturo Labriola, if he did not express the workmen's thought, fairly well expressed their revolutionary feeling, for he like them seems to be going through a crisis of thought which may lead him, as it may lead them, to anarchism. But at present whether considered as a socialist or as an anarchist Labriola can not be explained. At present he is illogical and contradictory both in his thought and in his activity. But with all that to be said against him he has tremendous personal power. I sat for three hours listening to him, and I must say that, with few if any of the ordinary gifts of the orator, he is the most magnetic and thrilling speaker I have ever heard. At times his discourse was like organ music, rising and falling with a peculiar harmony. His climax was not a usual one, it was climax upon climax until at last one seemed to burst in profusion like a giant sky-rocket. And then at times his oratory was disjointed and discordant. It made one think of Browning's line.

"Why rushed the discords in but that harmony should be

prized." It was a most remarkable speech. It was apparently the sincere and frank expression of his own soul. He apparently kept nothing back. He was illogical but conscientious, and he seemed not to realize that his own individual crisis in thought was hardly to be presented as Syndicalism.

The battle of tendencies was not to Labriola, but he won a personal triumph that was immense. The various factions had again and again interrupted him during his address. At times it looked as if there might be a riot, and several times during his discourse the Chairman could not maintain order for many minutes together, but at the end of his address and after one of his climaxes the entire audience rose to its feet and applauded with all its power. Those near him ran forward to embrace and kiss him.

I can only briefly sum up his views. He spoke in favor of a vigorous campaign of propaganda against clericalism, against the monarchy, and against the military. He spoke disparagingly of parliamentary methods and confessed his reliance upon the economic organization of the workers for the important changes that were to come. He criticized the leadership of the party as being middle class and as forgetting its reason for being and its direct responsibility to the working-class. He said, *L'intellectualism* ought not to be parasitic. It ought to be put at the service of socialism. It ought to be *L'intellectualism* which illuminates the way in advance of the socialist cause." He thought it unimportant whether or not the workers were forced to labor an hour or so more or less in the day. "Let him work," he shouted, "society will enrich itself thereby, and we will find a far greater harvest when the day of our victory and ascension shall come." He said it was folly to hope for the transformation of society by parliamentary action alone and that "the emancipation of the workers can only be accomplished by the workers themselves, and not by their proxies, by some persons interposed." The nationalization of public utilities was to him unimportant because the state exploited the workers quite as mercilessly as private capitalists. Socialism of the state is only another word for capitalism of the state.

After disposing of all the various methods advocated by socialists of whatever view to improve the condition of the proletariat, he asks, "What then remains, what is there essential and truly revolutionary in socialism, if it is not the free effort of the working-class, the economic organization of the proletariat upon the field of the class struggle, the grouping of the workers in their trades, federated among themselves for the defence of their common interests and preparing themselves to take one day into their own hands the direction of social work.... In order to arrive at this result political action can only play a secondary role;

it is the general strike which is the decisive weapon, the supreme means of emancipating the working-class."

These are very briefly the views of Labriola. In them lie not only bitter opposition to the program of the reformists, but to parliamentary methods as well. Labriola becomes with his so-called syndicalism as extreme as the parliamentarians and reformists have become in the advocacy of their methods of creating a socialist state. It is quite true that Sorel and Lagardelle in France and Leone and Labriola in Italy are forcing those of the opposing extreme to recognize more than they otherwise would the value and indeed the necessity of the strong organization of the working-class on the economic field; but the socialists of the United States and of England know how absurd it would be to consider this as the sole means necessary to create a socialist state. It is common knowledge with us that the union movement is revolutionary and often violent in the early stages of its development. Wherever the organizations are weak they are the most combative. As they grow more experienced and develop strength they become more careful about risking defeat by hastily considered or ill-advised action. The trade union movement in Italy is still in its early stages and while the members are mostly socialists, the leaders may become as with us many of the trade union socialists of the seventies and eighties became, extremely careful not to risk the prosperity of their economic organizations by assisting in a general movement for the benefit of the working-class. The English and American socialists, who, only now after a long period of syndicalism, are beginning to realize that they have left undeveloped and unused one of their greatest weapons of defense and of aggression, namely their political power, will regret profoundly if the Italian socialists, becoming disappointed in the partial use of their political power, think to gain more by the sole use of their power of organization on the economic field. If Italy has its *socialist* politicians sitting at the banquet tables of what are, so to speak, their Civic Federations, so has the American *syndicalist* movement. The development of socialist thought and feeling in both the political and the economic organizations of working-class will alone suffice to render such acts impossible. The change from the parliamentary to the syndicalist method will have but little effect, except to cripple the power of the working-class in a different war. All that Labriola can say against reformist socialism can be said with equal force against non-political unionism. Both the one and the other may become powerful factors in maintaining in power the capitalist system.

But that which is transient in either parliamentarism or syndicalism must not be permitted to become a basis for the destruction of either the one or the other of these weapons of the work-

ing-class. It is contradictory and narrow-viewed of Labriola, a member of the Italian Socialist Party, to deny its uses because it has defects. There is certainly something wrong with the Italian party, but rather than attribute it to the political method I should feel inclined to attribute it to the dominance of the middle class and the professional element in its positions of power. Intellectualism has been as much an injury as a help to England and left to itself it would be incapable of creating a movement. In fact its fads, factions and quarrels have made it supremely difficult for the working-classes to unify themselves politically. Now that labor has at last found its feet we find that it has been done almost without the help and sometimes in the face of the direct opposition of the intellectuals. How the same thing shall be done in Italy no one can say.

That which I have given was the basis of the entire work of the Italian Congress. In the voting Labriola was defeated by a heavy vote resulting from a union of the reformists and integralists. The movement goes on united if unity is possible where there is so much feeling between the factions, and if it is possible to preserve unity by means of voting programs. How much it is a mere unity of form without a unity of spirit one can not say. Certainly the divisions between the factions seem very deep and forbidding. They made me feel grateful that I was not an Italian socialist. I should not know what to do or whom to support. And this must be a very common feeling among the Italians with the effect that their work must be to a certain extent weak, uncertain and halting, all of which is especially deplorable for Italy. The working classes there more than perhaps anywhere else in Europe need the training and development that comes from participation in organizations of their own. They need its steadying influence and the education that it gives in reliance upon themselves. They need both their economic organizations and their political organizations, and anything which retards the growing and strengthening of these resources and supports to the working-class of Italy does it a very bad turn. But what shall come I know not. To me confusion reigns.

To one sitting in that hall, not in the heat of a faction or under the spell of a personality, the spectacle was of a kind to make one despair. At the end it was all tumult. There were shouts, congratulations, exultations,—there were the victors and the vanquished. The congress of the Italian Socialist Party was another thing of the past in the city of things of the past. It was not without a feeling of relief that one left the new temple to walk through the wastes and ruins of the old. From the terrace of the senatorial palace one sees the white, deserted temples of a thousand gods, the vast wastes of the precious, unrewarded

and gigantic labor of the poor. By the love and labor and hope of the disinherited the temple of Saturn was built and that of Castor and that of Vesta and that of Futura and that of Concord. The arch of Septimius was their labor and so too were the towering arches of the basilica of Constantine. And to-day it is but a step, as it was three thousand years ago, from this spacious, but now *dead*, city into the narrow alleys of the *living* poor. It was their work. It was they who had built it all. They had cut its marble from the hills, dug the trenches, laid the foundations. Every wall, column, arch, they had put in place. The city of palaces, of baths, of circuses, of arches, of temples they had built again and again. They had laid its pavements and filled its streets with exquisite beauty. They had built palaces for their tyrants, for their kings, emperors and senators, for their priests, for their demagogues, and for the mistresses of their tyrants and emperors and priests and demagogues. But for themselves they had in B. C. and A. D. hovels and alleys.

Is this new movement going to repeat in Italy the old old story? That is hardly conceivable, but in Italy instead of union, education, organization the party brings to the proletariat the quarrels, tendencies, hairsplittings, and personalities of a few middle class intellectuals. It is, I fear, a party of Roman patricians with the votes of a restive, revolutionary, proletariat. Is this too harsh — perhaps it is. It may be that these first impressions of the Italian socialist movement are all wrong and no more than I can hope that this is so, for Italy needs socialism as much as any land under the sun. It is her only hope and I should think that any man with the heart of a human being would be a socialist in Italy. The misery is so great there that even the hardest heart must be touched. I think of one valley, so smiling, so beautiful, with a thousand terraced gardens on its exquisite slopes, under skies that enrapture the soul and with men, women and children that rend and lacerate the heart. After one sight of that humanity, there are no more skies, no gardens, no valleys, no hills. I would rather forever live in Dante's Hell than another day there among my wretched human brothers. Great God, isn't the Valley of Tirano all the school Italy needs for socialism! Aren't the streets and alleys about your temple, living, and about your Coliseum, dead, all that is needed for your propaganda! The faces there are the faces with big eyes and sunken cheeks, the faces of the starving that everywhere in Italy tear the heart with claws of steel. They are faces, once seen, can never be forgotten; they are with you when you eat and your food sickens you; they are with you when you dress and your clothes become hateful to you, they are with you when you try to sleep and the night haunts you.

Perhaps some men in Italy can shut their hearts and walk upon these faces and eyes, perhaps some men must do what St. Francis did, give all, absolutely all; but is it possible that any one can know and see and feel and not be a revolutionist?

ROBERT HUNTER.

How to Read "Capital"

IN ONE respect at least Marx's "Capital" deserves comparison with the Christian Bible — it is the most talked about and the least read book among its followers. There are thousands of copies of the first volume of "Capital" among the socialists of the United States, yet it is only occasionally that a person is found who has really mastered it. The most common explanation of this is that it is extremely hard to understand. To a certain extent this is true. It is true of any great fundamental work. Yet I have seldom found a workingman, who, if he would take the time to study, could not grasp the Marxian philosophy.

I have found hundreds of readers of Marx, however, who never could get beyond that first chapter. It always seemed to me unfortunate that the logical order of the work determined that this chapter should serve as an introduction. That technical discussion of "commodities" has proved the undoing of thousands of would-be Marxian students.

Yet there are portions of this first volume of "Capital" (and I speak only of this volume at present) that are dramatic, absorbing, with flashes of humor and touches of eloquence that place them well up in the ranks of literature, aside from their argument.

Because of these facts it has been a hobby of mine that if the method of approach were changed it might be made much easier to understand Marx. I am the more led to suggest this idea because all of the attempts to popularize Marx, "Capital" have been dismal failures. I think I have read nearly all these attempts, and believe that the above opinion voices the conclusions of nearly every Marxian student (who has not written such an adaptation or popularization).

I do not mean to claim that the order of reading which I am about to suggest is preferable as an orderly arrangement of the argument to that left by Marx, but simply that by selecting those portions which are most entertaining and most easily understood, and which are none the less fundamental, as a beginning, the portions which are ordinarily looked upon as so extremely difficult of comprehension will have had many of their obscurities unconsciously cleared away.

I would, therefore, suggest that the reader who is approaching Marx for the first time begin with Chapter XV of Part IV, (p. 405 of Kerr & Co.'s edition). This is the chapter on "Machinery and Modern Industry," and the factory workman at least

will find himself at once in the midst of a world with which he is familiar. He will meet with the words he uses in his daily work. He will find ideas which have always been within his reach presented to him in a form that will carry infinitely more meaning than they have ever done before — and this is largely the secret of what makes interesting reading.

Here he can read the famous definition of a machine which has now become classical and has been accepted (or shall we say stolen, since credit is almost never given) by nearly all the orthodox political economists. Make a note of these pages to read to your single tax friend the next time he tells you that the socialist does not know the difference between a tool and a machine.

Note in the pages that immediately follow how the introduction of the various forms of motive power has brought corresponding social changes. The four pages following p. 418, and closing the first section of this chapter, are one of the fullest discussions given by Marx of the relation of industrial to social changes, in other words of the materialistic interpretation of history, yet it is seldom referred to by writers on this subject. This whole chapter is illustrative of this method, and this fact should be closely borne in mind by the reader.

In this chapter we find Marx' discussion of just how machinery "saves labor" and how this "saving" redounds to the benefit of the capitalist. All this is told with a wealth of illustration that cannot but make it intelligible to even the careless reader.

When this chapter has been read follow the well-known example of the novel reader and skip everything to the conclusion and see how the plot turns out. Part VIII, on "The So-called Primitive Accumulation," is the biography of the capitalist. The eight chapters of which this part is composed constitute a study in industrial history. Whenever an attempt is made to indict the present capitalist we are always told that he secured his capital by "honest" methods and that he should be compensated. No man can read these chapters and not forever after realize that even from the point of view of the ethics of capitalism the present owners of the earth can claim no right to their possessions.

This portion of the book moves on with a majestic tread in its argument, its summing up of facts, its power of logic until it culminates in Chapter XXXII, "The Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation." This chapter is one of the great classics of Socialism. With the chapter which preceeds it, it constitutes an epitome of the philosophy of socialism. It has a strength of style, a sweep of argument, a prophetic insight which it would be hard to parallel elsewhere in the world of literature. It has been reproduced many times in socialist writings, but if there is any reader of this who does not at once recall it, let him lay

this down until he has read these two chapters. They will bear reading again and again, and will grow greater and give new meaning each time.

Around these two chapters have been waged the fiercest battles of Marxists and "revisionists." It is against the chapter on "Historical Tendency" that Bernstein directed his heaviest batteries.

Read it in the light of the facts of American industrial development and see how much wiser Marx was than those that wrote almost a generation after him, and were that much nearer to the facts which he foresaw and to which they were still blind.

The reader who has proceeded thus far will have obtained a fairly good grasp of one phase of the Marxian philosophy, — the materialistic interpretation of history, especially if he has already read the Communist Manifesto and Engels' "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific." If he has not read these works he had better stop at this point and familiarize himself with them.

Such a reader will have met with many phrases that he did not understand, but he could skip them without materially interfering with the comprehension of the argument. He will now want to know more of the mechanism of this capitalism whose life history he has traced.

It is the analysis of this mechanism, which constitutes the Marxian economics. The chapters we have discussed show how capitalism came, and whither it is going. The remainder of the book tells how capitalism operates while it is here. For this reason they are much more difficult to understand. Almost any one can grasp the history of the growth and evolution of electricity as a mechanical force, but only the trained electrician can calculate the methods by which a given electrical mechanism works.

Let us then turn back to the first chapter. Here we are learning the language which will be used throughout this portion of the book. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that we master this first chapter. There are only forty-seven pages of it and it is well to read it a half dozen times before going on. When we are sure that we know what is meant by a "Commodity," by "Use Value," "Surplus Value," and "Exchange Value," and "Labor Power," we shall find that much of the difficulties that have always confronted us in a study of Marx will have disappeared.

Then read straight on through the book, including the chapters already read, which will fall naturally into their relation with the whole, and not forgetting at the end of each part, to turn back and read the first forty-seven pages again, to brush up on the "vocabulary," as the student of a language would say.

It may be said that this is hard work. Certainly it is. But a mastery of Marx' Capital will go far towards supplying a good

education in economics and the philosophy of history. You cannot expect to get such an education by a few hours easy reading.

Moreover much of the difficulty of Marx comes from the fact that we have learned to think in terms of capitalist ideology, while Marx demands, as a preliminary to his comprehension, an understanding of the proletarian psychology. This explains why he is even more difficult for the college student than for the manual worker, and is practically incomprehensible to the bourgeois reformer.

I have said nothing about the other volumes of Marx. This is partially because they are as yet inaccessible in English and partly because the person who has mastered volume one, will scarcely need any suggestions on reading the others.

A. M. SIMONS.

New Movements Amongst the Jewish Proletariat.

III.

The path of new Zionism, of political Zionism, so called, has never been strewn with roses. It had its troubles from the very outset: Intended as a sure cure for all diseases of the Jewish national body, it met the fate of so many cure-all-medicines—the patient resolutely refused to take it. Many devices had been tried by the doctors of Zionism to induce the patient to take it: Appeal was made to his instinct of national self-preservation; the glorious past of the Jewish nation was brought into play, the blessings that await him in the future were painted in the most dazzling colors; the great prophets of old were disturbed from their eternal repose to bear witness to the great mission of the chosen people; the great danger to his national existence, its annihilation was demonstrated in a thousand different ways: the doctors themselves each took a “dose,” but all this was of no avail! The real patient, the great mass of the Jewish workman steadfastly and persistently refused to touch it. Instead they have thrown themselves, body and soul, into the socialistic movement which at that time began to show symptoms of life. Here again real life and the ideals resulting from it, proved to be more powerful than the ideals called into life artificially. And what wonder? Social life in Russia was disturbed by the high waves of the revolution; the youth of the country was burning with impatience for activity, the hopes of the proletariat were running high, the hour of liberation seemed at hand, and the Jewish masses threw themselves into the revolutionary whirlpool, brushing aside Zionism with its reactionary contents. Zionism found itself on the verge of collapse, and as a means of self-preservation it was compelled in one way or another to adopt some measures, to take some stand towards this feverish activity of the Jews in the revolution. As a result we see a new variety of Zionism looming up — Zionism blended with Socialism. Whether this movement originated in the head of some leader, or came into being spontaneously, by a sort of instinct, does not alter the fact that Zionism, the supposed remedy for the ailments of the Jews, could itself be saved only by the aid of Socialism. Dr. N. Sizkin, the Social-philosophic family physician of Zionism expressed this thought very clearly, in an article entitled “Zionism and the Multitude.”

There seemed to have been no doubt in the mind of the learned doctor that Zionism was the real drug for the diseased Jewish national body. The only thing which seems to have disturbed his tranquility of mind was this very difficult problem of how to administer the medicine to the patient. On the one hand there is Zionism which promises to redeem the nation from bondage, on the other hand it is powerless to accomplish anything without the help of the masses of the Jews, "and the Multitude," he laments "had not arisen to rally around the flag of Zionism; Zionism not having awakened in him the enthusiasm necessary for the salvation of the nation."

Zionism, thus, needs the aid of the masses, in the same proportion as the masses needs the help of Zionism. His motto is, therefore, "Zionism for the Multitude and the Multitude for Zionism."

But how are we to accomplish this almost impossible fit? How are we to get the multitude to adopt Zionism?

To this question the good doctor replies in the following language:

"In order to make the multitude rally round the banner of the Zionist movement of liberation it is necessary that the ideal of Zionism should be understood not only as a remedy against the national sufferings, but also as a deliverance from all the misery and privations which the masses are subject to in the present order of society. A new social order in the New Land! A social order based on freedom and equality; an order without the contrasts of master and slave, rich and poor, capitalist and proletariat; a society established on new economic principles, and collective ownership of land."

Here we have the whole scheme in plain words: Zionism is the only cure for the poor, downtrodden persecuted Jewish nation, but the great masses will take the bitter pill only when coated with the sugar of Socialism — Socialism is to become the hand-maid of Zionism.

This worked well, for the moment. The patient swallowed the medicine, but, alas! the effect proved to be disastrous. Indeed the very first attempt at compounding the two "elements" proved to be a perilous undertaking.

For the purpose of successfully executing the design of drawing the multitude to Zionism and administering Zionism to the multitude an organization by the name of "Cherus" (Freedom) was formed, and right here at the first step, the incompatibility of the two "elements" was manifested.

As Dr. Sizkin has demonstrated "scientifically", Zionism must be made to mean the deliverance of the masses from "all the misery and sufferings of the present social order." In other words: The propaganda of Zionism must include the propaganda of So-

cialism. But when it came to practical work, the organization decided to exclude from its programme "immediate demands." It, thus, from the outset declined to do any work which could bring the ideals of Socialism into the minds of the Jewish workingman. But why should the organization that has made it its aim to infuse Zionism into the Jewish workingman, with the aid of Socialism, why should this organization refuse to adopt any social policy?

"Cherus" explains it thus:

"Because the work for Zion is of a different nature than the work of ameliorating the condition of the Jew to-day, in the land where he lives, and it would be futile to attempt two conflicting tasks in one and the same organization". And as if afraid of being misunderstood the organization goes on:

"If we were to meddle in questions of social reform, our policy would of necessity have to be of a reactionary nature. Because in the Zionist movement are congregated men of different classes and various religious convictions, with the meddling in social problems, class-interests would clash, and this would inevitably lead to the adoption of a reactionary policy."

And to remove all shadow of doubt as to this meaning, it continues.

"The journeymen of the small and large manufacturers are constantly struggling against their employers for higher wages. The Zionist organization which undertook to mingle in economic problems of to-day, would have to take an active part in such contests. And under such circumstances it would have no room in its midst for the manufacturer.

"Again, co-operative stores would be of a great value to the small manufacturer, as well as to his workingman. Should the Zionist organization undertake to establish such stores, it would have simultaneously to exclude all small traders because the establishment of co-operative stores would be the ruin of the small storekeeper."

The whole thing is now clear; there is no room for misunderstanding: The Jewish workingman is to be told that Zionism is the remedy both for the national as well as economic evils, that a new order, based on the principles of collectivism, would be established in the new land; at present, however, and especially within Zionism, no mention should be made of the whole affair, because, otherwise, the class conflicts would lead to a reactionary policy.

But how is this new society in the new land to be built? By what magic is the Jewish workingman to learn of the blessings that await him in the new land? These questions you would in vain ask of the learned doctor, or his organization.

The difficulties, thus, began at the very beginning, and they

went on increasing with every step. Such is the nature of Socialism! Like Yahve it suffers no god besides itself, and if one tries to force upon it any foreign substance an explosion is sure to follow. And in this case the explosion occurred at the seventh Zionist Congress which took place in 1904 in Basel, Switzerland. And the explosion came with such violence that it disrupted the Zionist party, destroyed the organization "Cherus," turned upside down the good Doctor Sizkin and severely injured, almost mutilated, their socialism itself.

On the ruins of this violent eruption a new party arose, the party of Zionists Socialists. From now on Socialism gets the first place. Instead of Socialism, as heretofore, being the means by which to attain the ends of Zionism, it now becomes the end which is to be reached by means of Zionism.

The most remarkable thing in the whole story is that nothing extraordinary has happened to bring about this state of affairs. It was simply the logic of life, the force of socialist doctrine, that has opened the eyes of the Jewish proletariat of Zionist faith to what the learned doctor could not see as late as the year 1903, namely that Zionism as a cure for economic evils cannot go hand in hand with a policy that must necessarily be reactionary, that, on that account to have no policy at all is just as illogical; and lastly, that the class-struggle is more powerful than the "national spirit."

But, alas! The proletarian Territorialist-Socialist-Zionist, as they sometimes euphemistically call themselves, are just as unreasonable, if not more so, than the Zionism which they discard so bombastically.

IV.

Before we begin our analysis of the theory of the Zionist-Socialist, it is necessary to inform the reader that these "Zionists" are not Zionists at all; they are rather opposed to the idea of settling the Jews in Palestine. What they are after is a territory somewhere, where the Jews could settle as an independent nation. So much for the Zionism of it. As for the socialist part of it, it is nothing else but a misinterpretation, at best a misconception of the teachings of scientific socialism, although they claim to be strict Marxians, and their theory strictly scientific.

Let us now examine the theory itself. It runs thus:

The development of modern industry leads to the accumulation and concentration of capital. This accumulation of capital in ever fewer hands, causes misery, misfortunes and unhappiness not only to the workingmen, but also to the small manufacturer and the middle class in general, in that they can not withstand the competition of combined capital and are driven with an irresistible force into the ranks of the proletariat. At

the same time when the ranks of the proletariat are thus forcibly enlarged, the invention and the introduction of new machinery and the division of labor make many workers superfluous. And so the numbers of the working-class are increasing at the same time when their chances of employment are decreasing. The result, of course, being an ever increasing reserve army of unemployed, causing a fierce competition among the workmen with a tendency to keep wages to its lowest margin, lowering the standard of life, and, at last, creating a pauper class.

On the other hand this very capitalism carries within itself the germ of its own destruction: With its accumulation of fabulous fortunes, with its huge factories, with its development of machinery, with its bringing together of enormous masses of workmen under one roof, capitalism creates a class-conscious proletariat which is waging war against the capitalist class for economic supremacy and which will ultimately bring about the social revolution and thus emancipate mankind from economic slavery.

So far so good.

But this conflict is manifold, they further say. Simultaneously with the fight between the capitalist class and the working-class, of each nation there goes on a strife between the different nationalities which may be living in the same country. In this conflict it is no more the proletariat that is struggling against the capitalist and *vice versa*, here it is rather a contest of the capitalists of the different nationalities among themselves and of the proletarians of the different nationalities among themselves. The outcome of this struggle is always in favor of the ruling nation, which owns the national industry of the land. And what is more, this very portion of the proletariat which has the victory on its side, thanks to the favorable circumstance of belonging to the nation that owns the national industry, is also the one that is destined to bring liberty and equality to suffering humanity.

The conclusion of this theory is the following:

The Jewish nation is the weakest among the nations. It is in the first place, the most oppressed; its workingmen began to take part in productive industry at a time when the proletariat of other nations was more fully developed. They are therefore not permitted to take part in the main industries. "The Jewish proletariat is called into life not by the large, but by the small bourgeoisie; he appears not as an industrial workingman, but as an artisan of the sweat shop and house industry, and inasmuch as this sort of industrial undertakings is doomed to death with the further development of capitalism, and as the Jews are not admitted into the large factories they are doomed to become paupers, and as such unable and unfit to take part in the reconstructing of society.

The fact that the number of Jewish workingmen are steadily

increasing and that they are very active in the socialist movement, as well as in the actual revolution in Russia—this fact, they say, proves nothing. The proletariat (like electricity?) consists of two poles: the negative and the positive.

The negative proletariat is being formed in the small factories and sweat shops, where it acquires the spirit of discontent only, its accumulated energy, therefore, can be used as a force of destruction, but it can never become a power of construction, while socialism is mainly a doctrine of construction, the constructive power of which rests with the positive proletariat, which is being produced in the large factories operated with huge machinery. The Jews not being admitted into these factories, have no chance of ever becoming "positive" proletarians and are therefore deprived of the possibility of giving a helping hand to the upbuilding of the new, socialistic society.

These abnormal conditions force the Jews to emigrate en masse. But emigration does not help matters much. In their new countries conditions are not much better, as no national industry awaits their coming. Besides, immigration itself becomes difficult in view of the restrictive laws that are being enacted in England and the United States. The only permanent and real remedy, therefore is an autonomous territory, a territory where the Jews could settle as an independent nation. In such a territory the industry would, of course, be Jewish-National and the Jews could freely proletarianize, and so contribute, as positive proletarians, to the establishing of socialism.

There remains, however, one more point to be settled: How and where is this territory to be acquired? Who will be crazy enough to supply them with a territory? And here again it is strictly "Marxism" that comes to their rescue. Capitalists are always on the lookout for new markets. They always welcome new colonies. It is therefore, in the interests of international capitalism to help the Jews acquire a new land. And England, the classical land of capitalism, was really moved by its own interest to offer them Uganda.

To sum up, the whole theory amounts to this: The social revolution is inevitable. But it will be brought about by that portion of the proletariat that is employed in the large factories, because in those large factories the real constructive spirit of Socialism is bred. The Jews belonging to an oppressed nation, which is not in possession of any national industry, are not admitted into those large factories and can, consequently, not proletarianize in the "scientific" sense of the word and have therefore no opportunity to participate in the social revolution. In order that the Jews may aid in the reconstruction of society they must become positive proletarians. In order to become such proletarians their nation must be in possession of a national industry.

In order to establish such industry, they must acquire a new territory. Territorialism, thus, becomes necessary for the sake of socialism.

We shall yet use the opportunity to examine more closely this new interpretation. I would prefer to call it misinterpretation of Marxism. Meanwhile we will assume their assertions to be correct and try to follow up the logic of this "theory" from its own premises.

In the first place we notice that the whole theory is nothing else but a new excuse for Zionism or Territorialism. The "bourgeoisie" Zionists and Territorialists claim the necessity of a new independent land because in exile the Jews can not achieve high rank in the army; because their number in the intelligent professions is limited; because they can not acquire land or titles of honor. The idealist Zionists need a land for the expansion of the Jewish spirit; and the Socialist-Zionists are after a territory because the Jews can not proletarianize, because they can not become positive proletarians. Was it really necessary to cause so much disturbance, to split the Zionist party and to form a new one, to invoke Marxism and generally to make so much noise only to find a new excuse for Zionism? What matters it for what reason the Jews need a country? And if a reason be really necessary, why not the old reason? Moreover, it seems to me that the reason of the old-fashioned Zionists, that the Jews can not become of great importance and mighty in the different walks of life, is from a strictly nationalistic standpoint, more powerful and more appealing than the one of the so-called Marxists, that they, the Jews can not proletarianize.

Again, from their illogical conclusion it seems to follow that a new state is to be created for the expressed purpose of giving a chance to a certain number of people to make a social revolution. The Jews, they declare, can not become a constructive factor in the social revolution while living among the nations. What of it? The revolution will then be made without their aid, as long as it is bound to come.

To such a proposition, it seems, the Zionist-Socialist would never agree. The Jews must take an active part in the revolution. In exile, it is impossible, for the reasons, mentioned above. A new territory is the only solution. A queer notion this of socialism and the social revolution!

But let us not quarrel with them for "minor" matters, let us again admit the correctness of this supposition. But right here we are confronted with another difficulty. In this case the social revolution would have to be postponed until the Jewish State is ready for action.

From their "orthodox" Marxian standpoint, they could not think of a revolution until their state would reach a high point

in the development of capitalism, and until the proletariat has become a positive one, with a pauper proletariat in addition, with the formation of trusts and so forth and so on, as it is written in the code of Marxism. Now, the other nations that have begun their career earlier would of course get ready before them, and would have to postpone action until such time when the Jews are ready.

Let us go a bit further :

The whole movement though designed strictly to serve the interests of the proletariat, can in reality not move without the bourgeoisie. The main point in the programme of these Zionist-Socialists is the proletarianisation clause. Now proletarianisation implies capitalisation. One cannot become a proletarian without someone else becoming a capitalist. The fact that they insist upon being the proletarians does not alter the fact. The movement is therefore more nationalistic than specifically proletarian, their "philosophy" then can hurt them more than help. To put their theory in plain every-day language it amounts to this :

We, the Jewish workmen in exile, cannot become positive proletarians because our brethren, the capitalists cannot become positive capitalists. We therefore must acquire a new territory in order that our brethren come in possession of the national industry, and have a chance to exploit us in a real capitalistic manner, that we may become real, positive proletarians, that we may start a real class-conscious movement and ultimately make a revolution.

The bourgeoisie therefore becomes an indispensable factor in their new undertaking. They admit, it is true, their ignorance of the motives that would induce the bourgeoisie to help establish the new land, ("Marxian" philosophy seems to have forsaken them in this particular point), but they know that very little could be accomplished without the material aid of the Jewish capitalists. How do they expect to make the bargain? Whatever the capitalists are, they are not lacking practical common sense, especially when it comes to strike a bargain. Do they expect to get the capitalists to agree to their terms. The capitalists would at once detect the traps set for them by the Zionist-Socialists, and refuse to help establish a territory with the avowed purpose of making a revolution against them. Oh, no! They would never agree to sure death.

This is not intended as a joke, though it sounds humorous. My purpose is rather to show how ludicrous is the adoption of Marxism to the movement of Zionism, whatever its own merits may be.

More ridiculous yet is the main point of their contention.

The Jews must acquire a territory, because among the nations they cannot proletarianize and, consequently, can not help in the reconstruction of society. In other words: The "positive" proletariat alone possess the "power of reconstruction;" the "negative" proletariat can, at least be used only as a destructive force. The Jewish people, because of its peculiar economic condition, belong to the negative proletariat. As such it can only destroy but is impotent in building up. Therefore . . . they must build a totally new society in the wilderness. And this is deducted from the philosophy of Marx. How ridiculous!

But let us make another concession; let us forgive them this inconsistency, too; let us admit that this "powerless, destructive" and "negative" proletariat will be able to build up a new society; let us admit that the capitalists will be stupid enough to agree to a bargain by which they are sure to be losers; let us admit that the social revolution will be postponed; let us admit, that it is desirable and possible to build up a country in order to make a revolution; let us finally admit that the role of the Jews in the present revolution in Russia has been and is only of a negative character. In a word, let us admit everything.

What then? Will this help any the Jewish nation? We have our doubts about it.

It must be remembered that even the Zionist-Socialists admit that the whole nation cannot possibly emigrate. At the best it would take fifty years for two or three million of people to settle in the new territory, in which time, as has already been pointed out, the depletion would be made good.

How will the new territory help those that are going to remain in exile? Senseless as are the contentions of the Zionist — both materialist and idealist — that a Jewish state somewhere will make the Jew be more respected, or that an "intellectual center" will tend to keep alive and develop the Jewish "spirit" of western Europe. Senseless as these contentions are, it may yet sound plausible to some. Difficult as it is to believe we can still imagine how the philosophic faculty in Jerusalem, for instance, under the guidance of the long since dead idealistic philosophy of "Akhd Haam" should influence some self-taught "philosopher" of Talmudic study. But how the "national" industry in the new Territory somewhere in Asia or Africa could help the millions of Jewish toilers in eastern Europe to become "positive" proletarians is beyond the comprehension of any sensible man. The majority of the Jewish nation is after all doomed to pauperism, and will still be unable to become a factor of construction in the social revolution. The only result of such territory would be to still more scatter the Jewish people. To the many countries where the Jews now live would be added another one — the

new territory. From the above it will be easily seen how utterly baseless and illogical is the whole "theory" of the Zionist territorialist. But the thing becomes worse yet, when we look into their "Marxism" from the real Marxian point of view.

JACOB MILCH.

(To be continued).

New Zealand Experimental Legislation.

THE year 1890 and 1891 will long be remembered by the workers of Australia and New Zealand. In 1890 Australasia was passing through one of the most disastrous strikes in her history—still referred to as the “great maritime strike.” Of course the men were beaten and the non-political trades unionist had it borne in upon him how helpless he was against organized capital with the government at its back. Then the Australian Labor Party was formed.

The following year New Zealand awoke. For many years we had suffered Tory misrule until it had brought us to the verge of national bankruptcy. Trade languished, workers were walking the streets unable to find employment, soup kitchens were opened in order to stave off starvation. The machinery of government was clogged with incapacity and corruption.

It is said that the occasion provides the man. It was so in this case, at least. John Ballance was returned to power. To the conceptions of John Ballance, most of the subsequent prosperity of New Zealand is due. Unfortunately Premier Ballance died in 1893, but his place was taken up by the now world-renowned Richard John Seddon, who, though he may not have had John Ballance's knowledge of economics, had his heart in the right place, and until a few years ago, before he had been spoiled by success, he faithfully struggled to place on the statute book many of the acts which the Ballance ministry had discussed at one time or another. Thus you will hear it said to-day that all that was good in Mr. Seddon's legislation was what he had received as a legacy from John Ballance. And one of the best administrative acts was that of placing Mr. Edward Tregear at the head of the Labor Department. While he holds such a position the workers of New Zealand have every confidence that the labor laws will be fairly and impartially administered.

In Socialist literature of the day New Zealand figures as the most advanced country along state ownership. The advanced men in every land point to us with pride as a practical proof of the soundness of their contentions. We have a land tax (presumably) for the bursting up of big estates. We have state aid to settlers; women's franchise; arbitration courts for fixing wages and preventing strikes; a labor department which sees to the enforcement of the factory acts, etc., and yet we have failed to solve the problem of the distribution of wealth.

Our present population is under 900,000. Of these 3952 oc-

cupy 27 million acres out of the 36 million comprising the occupied lands of the colony. The other 9 million are held by 62,140 persons. One hundred and six hold 10 million acres. These are exclusive of Maori holdings. Mr. J. C. Wilbon, president of the N. Z. Farmers' Union, at a recent meeting referred to the difficulty farmers had in getting land for their sons. The Hon. T. S. Duncan, minister of lands, speaking at the same meeting said: "If the land were all freehold the price would get so high that eventually no land would be obtainable at a reasonable price. There was land to-day which could never be made to pay at its present value." It is a matter of common knowledge that only the unusually high prices obtained for our butter, meat and wool on the London market enables the small farmer to pay rent and high interest charge. Mr. Coghlan, the well-known statistician affirms that wages have risen $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. during the past fifteen years. In the cities during the same time butcher meat has gone up 100 per cent.; house rent 30 to 50 per cent., other items from 10 to 50 per cent. Here is a return supplied to the labor department by the Wellington Timber Yards Union.

Wages	Children	No. of Rooms	Rent
48	7	5	20
45	3	5	20
50	4	4	13
40	5	4	14
38	3	3	10.6
30	4	3	11
35	6	3	20
45	7	4	20
<hr/> 331	<hr/> 39	<hr/> 31	<hr/> 128.6

This table shows that the average proportion of wages to rent is 38 per cent. This however understates the position. Take the first line in the foregoing table. A man, in receipt of 8 shillings per day (with seven children, making a family of nine), pays 20 shillings per week for a cottage of five rooms — this means, he must work for his landlord from Monday morning till dinnertime on Wednesday out of every week. The rest of the week he earns 28 shillings for food, clothing and other necessities. This, too, when the father is in full employment. How do these families keep the wolf from the door when the head of the house is idle through bad weather or any other cause? In another return one man earning £100 per year pays £52 per year rental (—) paid weekly. When alongside these high rents you place the admitted fact that in other directions the cost of living is steadily rising, until, despite all our Labor laws, the purchasing power of money is less than it was fifteen years ago.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Touching on this point, Mr. Edward Tregear, Secretary of the Labor Department in a letter to the Minister of Labor, said: "Some of the necessities cost more than in former years, their price is rapidly advancing, and this out of all proportion to the rise in wages of producers. The chief devourer of the wages of the worker and of the profits of the employer is excessive rent. With the above considerations in mind, I very earnestly ask the Government to take into consideration the question of legislating for the acquirement of suburban lands and the housing of the citizens."

This recommendation of Secretary Tregear was immediately acted upon and up to now some twenty or thirty houses have been erected in each of the four centres, but this I fear will do mighty little in the way of abolishing slums or checking the greed and rapacity of owners of house property. I think the best I can give as a closing sentence is the following from the speech of our late premier Richard John Seddon when addressing the Australian Labour Party last June: — "In New Zealand the classes who have benefited most by Labor legislation are the capitalists and land-owning classes." New Zealand has gone as far as any country in the world, in the direction of State enterprise. Her failure to emancipate the wage slaves leaves but one practical alternative — class conscious revolutionary Socialism.

W. ROBINSON.

Wellington, N. Z.

Industrial Evolution and Socialist Tactics.

THE Socialist movement naturally resolves itself into three periods: First — the Utopian period, when the basic principles were being discovered, Second — the period of theoretical education, when the army is drilled in those principles, and Third — the period of organization and conquest. We are just entering upon the third stage and from now on will direct more of our energy to the actual work of getting Socialism.

"But we can't get Socialism until we carry a National election." No, neither can a farmer get his crop until it is threshed, yet threshing is of minor importance with many of the preliminary operations. Our task heretofore has consisted in deciding what crop to raise, selecting the seed, winnowing it most thoroughly and sowing it in ground prepared by economic development. But there are mighty tasks before us that must be accomplished before we can reap the harvest.

There are four steps in the development of an industry from Capitalism to Socialism.

- 1st: Its various branches must be brought under one general management.
- 2nd: It must be owned collectively by the Nation, State or Municipality.
- 3rd: It must be managed to a large extent by the actual workers, excluding bond-holders and dividend getters.
- 4th: All citizens must have an equal opportunity to become workers. These steps may not be taken in the order indicated, or two or more of them may be taken simultaneously, — but they are inevitable, and not until the final step is accomplished can the industry be said to be Socialized.

Now it is our duty as Socialists to assist this process in every way that we can, hence we are attempting to capture the political power in order to use all of the force of organized government to effect the change. But the political power can only be wielded by a majority of the people, so the effort of our propaganda is to win a majority to our views.

It is evident that we will win minor victories before we can hope for a general success, and the most important problem confronting us is — how to so handle our forces as to hold and increase our minor conquests without compromising our principles or interfering with the natural evolution of industry.

The uselessness of attempting to appeal to any class financially interested in the perpetuation of the present system, and the

folly of being diverted from our main object by skirmishing against *effects* of Capitalism, are well understood by practically all of our members, but when it comes to assisting the trend to Socialism, we find ourselves on territory where the path is not so clearly defined. It is safe to say that there is scarcely a Socialist but would vote for the consolidation of small business concerns into a Trust, could such a matter be submitted to the people, — and many of them will go to actual inconvenience to trade with the octopus in preference to the struggling competitor. Yet, when it comes to taking the next step, we are treated to the astounding spectacle of a Socialist Local opposing a program for the municipalization of a public utility. True, such opposition has but little effect upon the final result as far as that particular instance is concerned, for whenever the general public has an opportunity to vote on the question of public ownership unhampered by side issues, they may be depended upon to vote "Aye" by large majorities.

"But Municipal Ownership is not Socialism!" Certainly not, — neither is the centralization of business, yet without the latter our propaganda would be hopeless. Neither of these steps are apt to be of immediate benefit to the working classes, but they contribute greatly to our progress, and the sooner they are taken the better it will be for us. The first step in the sequence is the hardest to attain, and if its accomplishment depended upon our arguments, we would indeed have cause to be discouraged. But as Capitalists relieve us of this first effort, so the great mass of the people who have not yet accepted our doctrines are pressing the campaign for the second, and it is worse than folly for us to oppose them. They even borrow another leaf from our text-book and submit the proposition to a "Yes" or "No" vote, and look with reasonable assurance to us for support.

"But they would saddle us with a bonded indebtedness." What of that? We naturally expect the public debts to continually increase, and the sooner they become insupportable the sooner comes Socialism, for the bond-holder is the very easiest of all the capitalists clan to expropriate. In exchange for the increased debt we have the management of the utility in question placed within direct reach of the people, and to a large extent we have removed a corrupting influence from our officials, — for it is well known that it is *private* ownership that corrupts the public officer.

Then we should support "municipal ownership?" By all means; it is our only logical course, — although this is not to be taken as sanctioning the support of any party or candidates outside of our own organization; rather it is to insist that in a Municipal campaign we should emphasize municipal issues. The people want municipal ownership, — let us lead the movement for

it, meanwhile continually pointing out the next two steps and insisting that we shall take them as soon as permitted by a majority to do so.

"This is step-at-a-time Socialism." To be sure, but once win the confidence of the mass of the working people and the steps will follow each other so rapidly that we will no more be able to distinguish them than we are the separate strokes of the piston of a flying locomotive, — each one of which is absolutely necessary to the forward progress of the train.

Trustification and Government ownership, marking the culmination of Capitalism, to a large extent will be brought about by capitalists, and should have our approval if not our actual support; but this is as far as Capitalism can go without committing suicide.

The next step, — the introduction of the principle of Majority Rule into industry, — marks the inauguration of the new régime. The more completely the previous steps have been consummated, the easier this one will be to take; but as it is the vital point in our movement, so it should be more thoroughly emphasized in our propaganda and demonstrated in our actions wherever possible. The mass of the people are slow to believe that we mean what we say upon these last two planks in our platform and fear that we mean to inaugurate a system of State Capitalism with the Socialists as masters. While this distrust exists our progress is slow, and no opportunity should be neglected to demonstrate our sincerity.

For example, the question of governing our Legislators, when we shall succeed in electing them, is evidently causing some of our members a great deal of worry. This has resulted in an attempt to tie the candidates to the apron strings of the party organization by compelling them to sign blank resignations, which are to be held over their heads if elected. Of course such documents are not worth the paper they are written upon as they cannot be enforced, — and even if they were valid the scheme is certain to be repudiated by the general public, for an office holder is responsible to all of the citizens of his district, or at least who have voted for him, — who usually outnumber the party membership thirty to one. Now, obviously, the thing to do is to make our representative responsible to the citizenship, — call all debatable questions before the people by mass-meetings and referendums. This will educate the people to a keener interest in political affairs, afford an admirable opportunity to ground them more thoroughly in our doctrines and, above all, will win their confidence so that there will be no danger of their backsliding.

"But they will make mistakes." Certainly, — so will the

Local, — but these mistakes will not be irrevocable and will be preferable to any attempt at dictation by a minority.

We must trust the majority; the more we educate them the more trustworthy they become. Refuse to trust them and we are ruined, for the workers of the world will never exchange industrial for political boss-ism.

E. BACKUS, Station L., San Francisco.
Member State Committee S. P., of California.

Report to the National Committee of the Socialist Party.

"The last meeting of the International Socialist Bureau held on November 10th, 1906, perfected arrangements for the coming International Congress to be held in Stuttgart, Germany. The Congress will be opened on the 25th day of August, 1907, and will last until August 31st, 1907. The Bureau requests the representatives of all affiliated socialist parties to submit reports on the developments of the Socialist and Labor movements in their respective countries since the date of the late Amsterdam Congress. These reports will be properly compiled, and published in German, French and English. The compilation will be a very important and instructive contribution to the modern history of the International Socialist Movement, and will afford a comprehensive view of the present strength and condition of the movement the world over. The reports are to be submitted on or before February 15th, 1907, and I expect to draft the report of the Socialist Party, and to submit it to the National Executive Committee for approval, before the date mentioned.

The conditions of admission of delegates to the International Congress remain unchanged, but a radical innovation is to be introduced in the mode of voting at the Congress. Heretofore, when a vote was taken by nationalities, the Socialist parties of each nationality had two votes regardless of the strength and standing of such parties. The Stuttgart Congress will for the first time make an effort to introduce the principle of proportional representation. The Socialist and labor organizations of each nationality will collectively dispose of a number of votes ranging from two to twenty according to the importance of the nationality, the number of dues-paying members of the Socialist parties, the strength of the trade union and co-operative movements, and the political strength of the Socialist parties within the country. Where the Socialist movement of any country will be represented by two or more parties, the votes will be apportioned among such parties in proportion to their respective importance. The voting list will be adjusted by the International Socialist Bureau.

The order of business of the International Congress will be as follows:

1. Submission of the various resolutions adopted by the International Bureau.

2. By-laws of the Bureau and of the Interparliamentary Commission.
3. Militarism and Prevention of International Conflicts.
4. The Relations of Political Parties and Trade Unions.
5. The Colonial Question.
6. Emigration and Immigration.

The affiliated parties may submit motions or resolutions on the various subjects to be discussed, as well as resolutions on additional topics, but all such proposed resolutions must be in the hands of the International Secretary on or before April 1st, 1907.

It will be seen at a glance that as far as our party is concerned, at least two of the subjects to be discussed by the International Congress, are of vital importance: the relation of political parties and trade unions and the subject of emigration and immigration.

With perhaps the sole exception of England, the trade unions play a more important part in the general labor movement in the United States than in any other country of the world. The American Socialists are, therefore, in a better position to study the nature, tendencies and influence of the trade union movement than their comrades abroad, and, on the other hand, it is no exaggeration to say that the progress of the Socialist movement here very largely depends upon the correct solution of the question of our relations to the trade union movement and upon the establishment of American workingmen organized in trade unions.

Our delegates will be expected to contribute substantial information and to submit definite propositions on that subject, and I would suggest that the National Executive Committee take immediate steps to draft proper resolutions on the subject to be submitted to the National Committee for approval, and on such approval, to be sent to the Secretary of the International Bureau.

In connection with this I herewith submit the trade union resolution adopted by the London Congress in 1896, which is the last utterance of the International Congress on the subject (I translate from the official German report.)

"The trade union movement of the workingmen is indispensable in order to resist the superior power of capital and thus to improve their present conditions. Without trade unions no living wages and no shortened hours of labor. But the economic struggles only palliate exploitation, they do not remove it. The exploitation of the working class can only be terminated if society itself will take possession of the tools of production including the land and means of transportation. This presupposes a

system of legislative measures, and in order to carry out such measures completely, the working class must become the deciding political power. But it becomes such political power only in a measure as it is organized. The trade unions make the working class a political power already for the reason that they organize it.

"The organization of the working class is incomplete and inadequate if it is only political. But the economic struggle requires also the political activity of the working class. What the workingmen conquer in the free struggle against the exploiter, they must often re-establish legislatively as a political power in order to secure it. In other cases legislative conquests make trade conflicts unnecessary.

"In connection with similar resolutions of the Brussels and Zurich Congresses, this Congress, therefore, declares the organization of the workingmen in trade unions as an urgent requirement in the struggle for the emancipation of the working class, and considers it to be the duty of all workingmen who endeavor to free labor from the yoke of capitalism, to join the union in their respective trades.

"The trade unions in order to be efficacious, should organize into national bodies, and all divisions of forces into rival organizations should be discouraged.

"Differences of political views should not be a reason for division in the field of economic struggle, but on the other hand, the very nature of the proletarian class struggle makes it the duty of labor organizations to educate their members to be Social Democrats."

The attitude of the Socialist Party towards labor immigration is also one of the most important to the Socialists of this country. The subject was discussed at the last International Socialist Congress held at Amsterdam, and two resolutions were submitted on the subject: One drafted by the committee elected for the purpose, and the other offered by several individual delegates from Holland, Australia and the United States. In the ensuing discussion each of the proposed resolutions found some support and encountered some opposition, and finally upon the suggestion of Keir Hardie, both drafts were withdrawn in order to afford the Socialist parties an opportunity to make a more thorough study of the subject.

Our party as such has never pronounced itself on the question. Our delegates at the Amsterdam Congress were left to follow their individual judgement, and when the two resolutions came up for discussion, they found our delegation divided. The amendment was signed by Comrades Lee, Schlüeter and

Hillquit, but was opposed by the other members of the American delegation.

The committee resolution and the proposed amendments are as follows:

"COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

(Translated from the Official French version.)

"The Congress declares that the workingman emigrant is the victim of the capitalist regime, which often forces him into expatriation in order to secure a bare existence and liberty:

"That the immigrated workingmen frequently have in view to supplant strikers which some times result in sanguinary conflicts between workingmen of different nationalities.

"The Congress condemns all legislative measures having for their object to prevent emigration.

"It declares it to be absolutely necessary to inaugurate an agitation tending to enlighten the emigrants artificially attracted by capitalist promoters, and to counteract the false information.

"It is convinced that under the influence of socialist propaganda and working class organization, the immigrants will after some time range themselves with the organized workingmen of the country of their adoption, and will demand a fair wage.

The Congress declares, among others, that it is desirable that the socialist representatives in Parliaments demand that the governments should by a strict and efficacious supervision combat the numerous abuses to which the immigration gives rise, and that they should adopt legislative measures which would enable workingmen immigrants to acquire as soon as possible full civil and political rights in the new country, and that they should resume their former rights as soon as they return to their native country, or that the different countries assure to immigrants the same rights by reciprocal treaties.

"The Congress enjoins upon the Socialist parties and trade organizations to make larger efforts than heretofore to extend among the immigrated workingmen the propaganda of labor organization and international solidarity."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

"The Congress, recognizing the dangers to the working class which arise from the immigration of foreign workers for the reason that these may bring about a lowering of wages, a ready supply of strike-breakers, and sometimes bloody conflicts,

"Declares, that under the influence of agitation on the part of Socialist organizations and trade unions, the immigrant work-

ingmen will after a time join the organizations of native workingmen and demand the same rate of wages as the latter.

"The Congress, therefore, denounces all laws which tend to exclude foreign workingmen who have been forced to emigrate through oppressive conditions in their respective countries.

"The Congress, considering furthermore that workers of backward races (such as Asiatic and African coolies) are frequently imported by capitalists in order to keep down native labor by means of cheap competition, and that such imported workingmen, who very readily submit to exploitation, frequently live in a condition of thinly disguised slavery, the Social Democracy

Declares, that it will combat with all means at its command the application of this method to destroy labor organizations and lower the standard of living of the working class, whereby the progress and the ultimate realization of Socialism would be retarded."

It will be noticed that the issue raised between the original resolution and the proposed amendment is one of our attitudes towards purposely and artificially imported labor. The international character of the Socialist movement implies, as a matter of course, that the Socialists of all countries treat bona fide workingmen immigrants with the same solidarity and brotherhood as the native workingmen, and advocate the wide opening of the trade union doors to such immigrants. But can we, as Socialists passively tolerate the capitalist practice of artificially stimulating emigration, and importing cheap labor from foreign countries for the express purpose of lowering the standard of indigenous labor and creating a reserve army of strike-breakers? Do we favor or are we opposed to such legislative measures as the Chinese Exclusion Law or the Prohibition of Importation of Contract Labor? These are questions which our party can no longer evade, and as in the case of the trade union question, I suggest that the National Executive Committee prepare a resolution on the subject to be submitted to the International Congress after approval by our National Committee.

Dated New York, December 24, 1906.

MORRIS HILLQUIT."

Why is there no Socialism in the United States? *

Professor Werner Sombart has published a new book entitled: "Why is there no socialism in the United States?" (Press of J. O. B. Mohr, Tuebingen.)

The problem is certainly a very interesting one and very important to the understanding of both socialism and capitalism. Not only the Social Democracy, but also the socialist professors indeed nearly all modern sociologists teach that socialism is the necessary counterpole of capitalism. It is its fruit, its special product. Everywhere that capitalism rules, there also must socialism be produced. Such is the theory. Now it is indisputable that in the United States of North America capitalism has reached a high degree of development. "In capital power, in amount of capital accumulation the United States stand already in spite of their youth far ahead of all other countries. The total capital of the United States (that is capital, reserves, deposits, and circulation) are reckoned by the controller of the currency for the year 1904 at 13,826 million dollars, while the corresponding figure for all the other countries of the world together is said to amount to only 19,781 million.

Next comes the tremendous well-known concentration of capital in the United States. "There are," continues Sombart, "seven greater industrial trusts, in which 1528 formerly independent establishments are united. The capital concentrated in them amounts to 2662 million dollars. The greatest of these giants is the United States Steel Corporation (the steel-trust) with a nominal capital of 1370 millions. The second largest is The Consolidated Tobacco Co. with a capital of 502 millions. After them come 298 smaller industrial trusts, which control 3426 factories and have a capital of about 4055 millions. Thirteen industrial trusts with 334 factories and 528 million dollars capital are being formed, so that the total number of industrial trusts is placed at 318 with 5288 factories and 7246 million dollars capital. To them are associated 111 more important franchise trusts (telephone, telegraph, gas, electricity, and street railway companies) with 1336 separate establishments and 3735 million dollars capital. But now comes the *pièce de résistance*; the

*Warum giebt es in den Vereinigten Staaten keinen Socialismus? Von Professor Werner Sombart. (A review in the Berlin "Vorwaerts" of October 9, 1906.)

group of the great railroads. There are six of these, none of which has less than a thousand million dollars capital. Together they dispose of nine billion and seventeen million (9,017,000,000) dollars of capital, and control 1,790 lines. Finally we have the "independent" railway companies with a capital of 380 millions. If one reckons all these giant combinations together, in which by far the greater part of American wealth is now bound, one comes to the enormous figure of 8664 controlled companies and twenty billion, three hundred and seventy nine million dollars of nominal capital. Think of 85 billion marks (or 20 billion dollars) united in the hands of a few speculators! According to the theory one would suppose that to such a highly developed capitalism at least as strongly developed a socialism must stand opposed. But of this there is little or nothing to be traced. (*What do you think of that?*) It is known that socialism has only vegetated in the United States for decades, and that only now is it about to have a strong growth. How does this happen? Is the theory false which asserts that capitalism necessarily brings forth socialism? Or how does the matter hang together? That is the problem which Sombart seeks to solve.

Professor Sombart is already known to our readers. In our number of August 24th in a review of his book, "Socialism and the Social Movement" we have characterized his kind: that flattering affability the value of which lies in giving the appearance of extraordinary friendliness to socialists. This unpleasant quality comes out less strongly in the new book. The unprejudiced reader will surely get the idea that he learns much from the book. Quite an abundance of facts and figures. Whoever does not know the economical and political conditions in the United States more closely will surely find in the book a large amount of usable material. But if one cannot prove it, — and who can do it? — one becomes very uncomfortable at the thought of the slight trustworthiness which the author has elsewhere displayed. And finally the sharp eye of suspicion discovers contradictions, and indeed a contradiction in the most essential point.

Briefly: Professor Sombart comes, after a very exhaustive analysis, to the conclusion: *the American workman has remained until now cold to socialism because he is well off under the capitalistic regime.* As the investigation, so long as one cannot test it in details, makes the impression of great thoroughness, one could be content with it, if, unfortunately, in the first part, where Sombart strives to bring proof of the complete effectiveness of American capitalism, there were not something quite to the contrary. There, on page 16, it is stated that "in the United States in times of average prosperity not less than ten million persons live below the line of poverty, that is . . . in food, clothing, and shelter have not the necessities," and that of these not less than

four million are public poor! An enormous figure with a total population of only about eighty million! "In the year 1897 *two million persons* received poor support (charity); in good times fourteen per cent, in bad times twenty per cent, of the population of this city live in poverty and misery. So many are known; but if one counts the proud, self-respecting poor also, the number of those in New York and the other large cities living in poverty rarely sinks below twenty-five per cent! In Manhattan (in 1903, a good year) as many as 60,463 families were turned out from their dwellings. One out of every ten persons dying in New York is buried as a pauper in the Potter's Field."

Those are contradictions, however, which can hardly be reconciled. And it is characteristic of Sombart's method that he brings the facts now and then to the place where they fit into his scheme, without troubling himself about their contradictions. It is evident again in this book that his main purpose is to make an effect. At first the powerful workings of the giant American capitalism are to be depicted: — there the painting of misery is fitting to strengthen the impression and to make to me. Later follow ever rosier descriptions, so that finally the reader stands under the impression: yes, of course, if the American working-man is so well off, one cannot wonder that he remains cold to socialism. "On roast-beef and apple-pie were all socialistic Utopias ruined."

But still more contradictions. If finally the long drawn out investigation leads to "roast-beef and apple-pie", where is the theory? One should suppose, one must conclude therefrom, that just where capitalism had made the greatest expansion it also provides a quite comfortable life for the workman. The author must, then, not only recognize that herewith all socialistic "utopias" are refuted, but also he must revise his own views held hitherto and grant that capitalism does not necessarily breed the socialistic view among the workers. But that Sombart does not do. He sticks by his sociological opinion, and consoles the reader by promising further books in the future. "I will try later to show that in no country in the world, objectively considered, is the worker so exploited by capitalism as in the United States, and that in no other country in the world does he sweat so under the collar or work himself to death so quickly as there."

And at the end of the book (page 142) he says, and wholly abruptly as his personal opinion "that all the forces which until now have retarded the development of socialism in the United States are about to disappear or be changed into contrary forces, so that according to all the signs socialism will develop in the unions during the next generation to the greatest perfection." He hopes sometime later to be able to give the foundation for this view.

Mr. Sombart demands a great deal of blind confidence from the reader. In the first twenty-four pages American capitalism brings terrible misery with it; then on the following hundred and twenty pages the living of the American workman is depicted as at least as comfortable as that of the well-to-do German citizen of the middle class, and at the end it is asserted without foundation that in the next generation all this will be reversed. But Mr. Sombart's scientific authority must be quite other than it really is for one to believe all that without further proof.

So Sombart has not solved the problem which the discovered contradictions present. But the critical reader, who never forgets what sort of an author he has before him, will get more of value out of this book than from the idle twaddle which Sombart gave to the world under the title of "Socialism and the Social Movement."

The reason why until now there has been no socialism in the United States worth mentioning Sombart asserts to have found in the political, social, and economical condition of the American workman, and further in the possibility always open to him of settling in the free west and so escaping entirely from the exploitation of capitalism. Because, as said, according to our conviction the author has not succeeded in solving the question, the value of the book for us does not lie in the answer he gives to the question asked in the title, but rather in the depicting of the actual condition of the American workman and in its comparison with that of the European.

As for the political situation of the American workman Sombart describes with great perspicuity the play of the political "machine," as it is unchained over there by the complete democracy. Since not only the president and the members of the parliament are elected, but also the most important officials of the states, the provinces, the "communes" (cities?), and the courts, the conscientious citizen has to vote on the average twenty-two times each year. (?) That demands an apparatus for the voting, which only a rich party can furnish. And this according to Sombart is an important reason why until now no third party has been able to arise. He cannot discover any great difference between the Republican and the Democratic parties. If such a difference formerly existed, now the two great parties continue to exist merely because they are there and a tremendous number of men live off them. All these "wirepullers" have a personal interest in the existence of these parties, whether they live on the election work, or secure public offices after the election. Now (still quoting Sombart) "first there exists for those workmen who put themselves forward as leaders of their class, the expectation of coming into wellpaid state offices, and secondly the great parties, being burdened by no principles, see no objection

to inscribing all the demands of the workmen (who, thanks to the equal elective franchise, are not at a disadvantage in making them) on their own banners (platforms), and so the latter have not been obliged to found a party of their own. Although in what Sombart here refers to, mere corruption plays a large role, still he means not only corruption. He writes for example (page 55):

"Imagine that it had been possible for the workmen of Berlin in the time of the socialist law to discharge the state prosecutor Teffendorf, or to-day to blow up any criminal court which is infamous on account of its rigorous punishments of strike misdemeanours; or to revenge themselves on a certain court by giving them their walking papers at the next election! (*The American workman can do that;*) but indeed at a price which will appear high to many: namely, he must join one of the great parties, because they *are great*. For only with their help is a successful influence on the election result possible.

So for example the governor of Colorado, the infamous Peabody, whose interference in the strike of 1903 is still in everyone's memory, was thrown down in the election of 1904, but not by growth of the socialist vote — these fell off on the contrary a half — but by the workmen voting for the democratic party which was thereby enabled to defeat the republican governor. In this way, thanks to the democratic constitution of his country, the American workman exerts an immediate and often deciding influence in politics.

More important is his economical condition. By exhaustive calculation Sombart comes to the following results: the wage of the American workman is from two to three times as high as that of the German. The rent is at the most as dear as with us, on the average rather less; to be sure the American workman pays out more for his dwelling, but only because as a rule he rents three to four rooms. In Baltimore, for example, a city of over half a million inhabitants, a whole family house with four to six rooms costs only 332 to 408 marks (83 to \$102) a year; in St. Paul (163,000) only half as much! (!!)

Lighting and Heating: — Kerosene costs about half as much in New York as in Mannheim or Breslau. Anthracite coal costs about the same over there as here.

House furniture of all sorts is rather cheaper in the United States than with us.

Food. The prices of the most important necessities are on the whole quite the same in both countries.

Clothing. On the basis of longer reckoning Sombart comes to the conclusion that also clothing costs the American workman little or no more than the German.

The conclusion is that the American lives far more com-

fortably than the German. He does not save any more, but occupies as a rule four rooms, the German not quite two. He furnishes his rooms comfortably. He eats almost three times as much meat, three times as much meal, and four times as much sugar as the German, who instead fills his stomach with potatoes. Finally in dress the American workman, and also the working woman make no distinction between themselves and the wealthy middle class. (*Ye shades of Ananias!*) Notice by the way: Sombart calculates that the German workman, thanks to his wretched standard of living, still saves a higher percentage of his wages than the American. (The editor adds in parenthesis: "Absolutely of course much less.") What does he do with it? According to Sombart's denunciations he drinks it up, while the American workman lives much more moderately, temperately. (*sic!*) His social position also corresponds with this economical position and political influence: that is the social respect which he enjoys with the other classes. Ye gods! The workingman over there is a "gentleman," and the working girl a "lady" just as good as any other. (*This beats even Bryan or Grimm's fairy tales!*) A tone and spirit of equal privileges and equality rules not only in social and public life but also within the capitalistic enterprises. Also the capitalists know how to interest their workmen in profit: first by profit sharing, and then by willing acceptance of able hints for the improvement of production. Moreover if they bring profit, the suggester always shares in it. And finally quite a smart business trick — they sell shares in the business to their own workers!

One must ask oneself, then, under such conditions why so many American workmen "flee to freedom," that is settle on hitherto unoccupied land in the west and so escape from the wheels of capital. If he is so well off he must feel extraordinarily well exactly under the scepter of capitalism. Instead of this, during a single generation no less than five million persons have emigrated from the eastern states to the western "freedom" (page 138), and just here Sombart sees one of the strongest reasons against the origin of socialism. That also is a crying contradiction.

(The first chapters of the work reviewed above containing the valuable statistical portions appeared in the International Socialist Review. When we came to the nonsense on the condition of the American worker we stopped further publication. As Sombart has used the fact of such publication as an endorsement of his work we publish the above to make this explanation.—Editor.)

The National Strike.

(From an Old Letter Written to a Friend in 1920).

TOWARD the last days of the System there were mighty things brewing; but few realized it. Men talked of the "social unrest," knowing not its import.

The Government had become an industrial oligarchy — a mere tool of the few, by the few, and for the few into whose hands had gradually centered the wealth of the Nation. Slowly the chains of industrial slavery had been fastened on the working people; their bills were not passed; their demands were ignored.

For a long time, however, the Socialists and Unions had been at work, hand-in-hand, in their quiet, determined way, planning, sweating, sowing their seed, laying their mines. With their knowledge of social evolution, their economic determinism, their materialistic conception of history, they alone held the key to the future. Under the direction of their leaders, men of thought, science, and scholarship, who saw and foresaw the trend of natural laws, they had tunneled under the social structures, though those in power knew it not: they had laid up money in their treasuries: they had builded an organization that was well nigh perfect: most of the scabs had come into the fold: solidarity had been achieved; and the class-conscious workers presented a united, but peaceful, dormant, and unaggressive front to Capital.

Still, entrenched power was not to be overthrown in a day. And even though the rotten old regime was honeycombed and tottering the world over, it held together with a show of glamour and strength. The police, the military, the brass bands, the parades of the flunkies and the servant-souled put up a brave front. The hypnotic bombast of political orators sounded very well; and fogs of specious verbiage shrouded real issues.

There still needed the torch which would ignite the low-lying, hidden ramification of mines and rend the body-politic from top to bottom.

Those on top still laughed, played, sang, and had their merry times. On the surface, at least, everything was running smoothly, just as it had been doing immemorially. The bourgeoisie were heedless of the fact that quiet waters run deep: they laughed and sneered at those who pointed to ominous signs.

"Pooh!" they said; "you are an alarmist and agitator. There is no cause for such incendiary talk. The old world will run itself somehow. Of course, there is poverty; of course, there is inequality. Has it not always been so? God has placed the resources of the world in our hands — we are his trustees. The divine right of kings? — nay, that was a fallacy, as time has proved; but there is the divine right of property, even such as we have to-day. The shrewd, the cunning, the strong, — they are born into this world with title deeds to the means of subsistence. Should not those of superior abilities own more property, and have the bigger voice in the making of laws? Where, otherwise, will be the reward of merit? Ha, ha, read Nietzsche and learn about the survival of the fittest. That's our philosophy: it's the law of Nature. And we are the fit. Competition? — why certainly, it is the life of trade. Justice? — yes, we pay our lawyers and our judges for justice. Fraternity? — pshaw! was there ever such a thing outside of a poet's sentimental dream! There always have been classes, and there always will be. Love? — yes, a beautiful thing for the women and the churches; but it doesn't go in business. Christ was not a modern business man: he had no economic interests to protect, no vested rights. He was a man of straw, who could afford to talk in that way. He did not even have a family dependent upon him. Scientific evolution of society and man's nature? Bosh! Human nature has always been the same, and always will be. Equality of opportunity? — why, of course! You have it already. Look at our glorious Constitution. This is a free country, where every man has equal rights. If you happen to come along after all the wealth is preempted and concentrated in the hands of a few, that is your misfortune. We can't help it. Get to work and make your career. You are an anarchist if you talk about attacking the sacred claims of private property and vested right."

So they went on and continued at their feasts and revels. They rode fast on the backs of their beasts of burden. Ignorant and intoxicated, as men have always been in similar circumstances, they jested, derided, and laughed every time their attention was called to the foreboding tremors which were sent through the social fabric by the leviathan of Labor, stirring in its slumbers as it became conscious of its strength and unity. They gambled with the people's food. They fed children to their machines to make profits. The three crushing burdens of Rent, Interest, and Profit, they placed upon the backs of the poor. The mines were the graves of the living. The railroads, reckless of life, speeding along on their mission of private gain, became Juggernauts ruthless and bloody. Great cities, morbid diseased growths of an unhealthy civilization, hideous in their

contrasts and contradictions, sprang up in accordance with the prescription of one part of Heaven to three parts of Hell. The factories ate up the lives of men and women; — took away their power to think, bent their forms, crushed their spirits, made poor broken machines of what God had intended for human beings. Crime was rife: fraud and deceit almost virtues. Women bartered their bodies and souls because of need. Suicides were rampant. Because so few had the time or the energy to discover truth and its oneness, sects and schisms were numberless. Births diminished. Insanity grew apace. The masses, unable to marry, unable to lead natural lives, to have healthy homes and happy families, exhausted their life forces earning a bare livelihood, or at times plunged into wild saturnalias of vice and debauchery where they could forget that faith was dead, love a misnomer — a mere “physiological need,” and that money was the only thing to live for. There were mansions, apartments, flats, hotels, lodgings, tenements, but homes became rare indeed. Back of the magnificent stone temple dedicated to a God of love, justice, and mercy were the slums of the slaves, reeking with depravity, filth, and every species of misery. Adjacent to the public hospital was the foodstuff factory, turning out poisons for the people. Legislators, purblind, and too ignorant to know that their own interests, happiness, and that of their posterity for all time, were inevitably intertwined with the interests and welfare of society as a whole, made and maintained laws for narrow, selfish and corrupt classes.

Yet still those on top, plethoric of wealth, heedless, calloused, strong, sang patriotic hymns, ignored the social cankers, followed their work and their pastimes, drank their wines.

Then came the great election.

The workers had long since become class conscious, and had gone to the polls with a solid front. They had realized the class struggle, and they had cast a straight ballot for their candidates and for freedom.

But their candidates were defeated.

Suppression of votes, bribery, boodles, chicanery, trickery, the fraud of the money power had done it: and the workers knew it.

The American Federation of Labor, which then had enrolled in its membership over ten million members, called a national convention. A vast concourse of men gathered in the big auditorium of the great city. They were grave, resolute men, who did not smile, nor joke, nor jest. Farmers, mechanics, laborers, miners, scholars, scientists, thinkers, — they gathered there, knowing that a crisis had come in the life of the Nation. The weight of a nation's destiny pressed upon their souls, and they knew it. They were ready to fight and to die if need were.

Into the vast room they filed, and with solemn silence took their seats.

The President rapped for order, and walked forward to the front of the platform.

He was a heroic figure — young, tall, dark, strong; the face of a scholar and thinker, the form of an athlete, the courage of a lion, a heart tender and compassionate, a brain big and comprehensive, knowing the reason of things.

"Comrades, fellow citizens of the United States," he began in a voice strong and sweet, which carried to the outermost bounds of the great assemblage: "Comrades, let us first sing the National Hymn."

And then he led the singing, as the vast crowd arose to its feet with a muffled roar.

"My Country 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing."

There was no instrument to blend its tone with the voices; nor was any needed; for it was a grave time, and men and women sang from their hearts if they ever did in their lives. Not one throat in that huge throng but helped to swell the volumn of sound which rolled up to Deity. It was more than a song; it was a prayer from the hearts of a people. And in that hour of destiny as the strains went up each one there knew what it was to love not only their country, but their fellow-man; they felt those deep well-springs of emotion which in times of momentous sublimity come to us like the whispering of God or the music of eternity. Tears, tears, that could not be repressed, sprang into the eyes of many. A people were lifting up their hearts to the Unknown. And whether they consciously worded their thoughts or inwardly tried to phrase their feelings, it mattered not. Whatever their faith, whatever their wisdom, they were one and all pleading to some Power higher than themselves, for an advertence of those terrible calamities into which the smallest jostling of Destiny's scale would throw the Nation.

The song was finished. Then came speeches. Some were violent and smacked of blood, bullets, bombs, and arson. Others were less impassioned, and spoke of more conservative measures. Both kinds were applauded; but feeling ran high, men were getting desperate, and the fiery eloquence which incited to war and revenge was applauded loudest and longest.

At last after stormy scenes, much wrangling and fierce debate, a compromise was effected, and a national industrial strike agreed on as the first weapon they would wield in striving for their rights.

That night, from national headquarters, the order was

hissed over the wires to the Local Labor Councils and the presidents of the various unions in every part of the country.

Twelve o'clock the next day saw the vast industrial armies of the Nation throw down their tools, quit their work, and walk out, leaving their employers to till the soil, run the machines, dig the mines, cook their steaks and bread, run their trains, fire their engines, harvest their crops, clean their streets, work their typewriters, elevators, dynamos, printing presses, cash registers, and so forth.

Never were there such doings in this fair land of ours; and God in his infinite mercy grant there may never be such again.

I will take a typical American city, — say, St. Louis, where I was then — and try to sketch briefly a few things that were happening there within a few days after the Strike had been called.

At first, there was rioting all over the city, before things became thoroughly disorganized. The old System died hard, but its wind was knocked out from the beginning; it was hamstrung at the first blow, and its utter impotency was soon made manifest. A terrible stroke of paralysis had smitten the social organism. Its dynamic force was dead. Its heart no longer beat. Dissolution, disintegration set in at once. There was no longer a co-ordination of parts. Correlations were shattered. Interdependences were cut. Cohesion and interrelations were smashed.

The "respectable elements" had tried to organize a militia, when they found that the dissolving police force were powerless to cope with the situation. But they soon gave up in despair. The Mayor tried to telegraph the Governor, and the Governor (I am told) tried to telegraph the Federal Government; but there were no stenographers to take the message; no boys to carry it, no operators to send it. No trains were running, no boats plyed their wheels. Every locality was cut off from the rest of the world, and had to fight its own battles. The blow had fallen. Civilization had come down with a crash. Communication and facilities, with one fell swoop were swept back into those primitive forms they had held in the time of Moses. Chaos reigned; and mankind seemed once more to stagger on the brink of savagery. For a time even the Revolutionists were appalled at the havoc they had brought about by a simple and peaceful assertion of that "right to work or not to work" which the bourgeoisie had so often thrown in their teeth: yet, saving some isolated and unavoidable acts of rowdiness and vandalism, they committed few acts of violence until they were aggressed upon. Bloodshed there was all about the city for the first day or two; but the blows came mostly from the struggles of Capitalism in its death throes.

In my walks about the City, such scenes greeted my eyes as I had never thought to look upon in this world. Some of them were grotesque in the extreme, some comic, some unspeakably sad, some inspiring, some depressing.

On Thursday a party of Revolutionists sacked several of the large banks and trust companies down town. Gold and silver coin — sacks of it — were tossed out and thrown into the street; and nobody stooped to pick it up. Think of it! Olive Street by the Bank of Commerce was a puddle of dollars and greenbacks. A party of jocular rowdies led by a gigantic barber, caught a fat banker, a stock broker, a well-fed lawyer, and a sleek minister, and tied them all together to a telegraph pole at the corner of Broadway and Locust. Then they brought out from the safety vaults a lot of gilt-edge "securities," stocks and bonds, and piled them around the terrified quartet. The barber delivered an oration to the victims, while the crowd pelted them with dimes and pennies.

"We are going to roast you alive, you exploiters of the people!" shouted the barber. "What a glorious death for you to die amid that stuff for which you lived, your pastor of the wealthy, conservative, and aristocratic church; you lawyer, who, for the sake of gain, prostituted the people's justice; you banker, who grew fat on the earnings of the poor; and you useless broker and gambler, who speculated in the resources of the Nation. Aren't you delighted to bake among your notes, mortgages, stocks, bonds, and commercial paper! How now, my preacher, who preached charity when you should have preached justice; who preached about the beauties of Heaven, when you should have preached about the evils of this world and their remedies; who sang hymns and read medieval prayers, when the real works of the world was crying aloud for a true advocate. Better, far better, had it been for you, if you had raised turnips, or cut wood, or done some other useful service for the world. You talked beautifully of saving the souls of the dead, when the souls of the living were rotting under your very eyes.

"And you, Mr. Broker, what useful services have you done for mankind? How much wealth have you created. How much wiser or happier is the world for your having lived?

"And you, Mr. Lawyer, have you always stood for justice and the side of the oppressed, or have you done the bidding of wealthy clients, twisted the law to suit their will, been technical instead of fair, and prostituted your abilities, your talents and your manhood for the sake of gain?

"Comrades, bring me a match and let us light the securities."

I turned away then; for I knew the prisoners would not be burned, though the fire was actuality started, and as I left I

saw the yellow flames eating their way into some bank and railroad stocks that a few days before had been worth hundreds of thousands.

I walked down Broadway, past the big department stores, and turned into Olive Street. The streets were crowded. Men, women, and children were hurrying to and fro, purposeless, like ants in the ant hill, which you have kicked over with your foot. The stores were wide open, but there were neither buyers, sellers nor despoilers so far as I could see. At the corner of Fourth and Pine I saw a group of grain brokers and a prominent wholesale merchant cooking their dinner in the street.

Out in the residence portions of the City things were no better. Walking through beautiful, exclusive Westmoreland Place, where the palaces of the very wealthy reared their stately forms, I saw the portly wife of a man who before the crash, was said to be worth five millions, stooping over a wash tub and scrubbing soiled linen. A party of union housemaids, cooks, waitresses, and laundresses were standing there watching her and jeering at her derisively. "He, he," they cried, "look at my lady. Oh, dear! Isn't it too bad that such an aristocratic elegant lady should be compelled to wash her husband's soiled clothes. How does it feel, my lady, to be doing something useful? Quite a novel sensation, isn't it? Ah, well, never mind, — it will reduce your flesh. It's a good exercise if you don't carry it too far, and it may save you from a fashionable attack of nervous prostration."

The wife of the former magnate turned her back on them and treated them with silent contempt.

Further on I saw the wife and daughters of a brewer collecting sticks and stray lumps of coal from the railroad track which skirts the park. They had started a fire in the back yard of their mansion, as the gas ranges were no longer running, and were boiling potatoes and making biscuits for their midday meal.

To be Continued.

Our New National Hymn.

We are a Nation of Traders, they say —
Our hearts' blood is spent, and we waste living hours
In building a Market, — well, praised be the Powers,
 We thrive as a Nation of Traders!

The peoples of lesser growth bend to our wills;
Their needs are our fortunes; our traders, their lords;
We draw forth their wealth with the points of our swords,
 And we are a Nation of Traders.

We strip off the hide of the dull Esquimo,
And give him some cheap, simple tool in return;
And we leave him quite happy, with plenty to learn, —
 For we are a Nation of Traders.

We're chided for wasting the sweet, golden days
In striving for riches, for power, for place.
Well, that's all we believe is contained in Life's vase,
 And we draw forth our portion as traders.

What profit have we, if we delve into Art?
Mere sentiment, holding for us but a name.
We'd rather go down on the pages of Fame
 As the Mightiest Nation of Traders!

Descendants will bless us for what we have done
By the grace of the Law, and the aid of the Sword;
For we'll leave them a Market. So praised be the Lord,
 We shall live as a Nation of Traders!

H. DUMONT.

EDITORIAL

A Year of Disintegration.

As viewed at the present moment, it would appear that the year 1906 might stand out in the future as a year of disintegration in the forces of capitalism. This is not the superficial view which is popular. Apparently it will go down as a year of greatest prosperity. Every one of the countless summaries that are ground out at this time of the year is full of statistics of multitudes of records that have been broken, of bumper crops, of unsurpassed bank clearings, of hitherto unheard-of business done in all directions.

Alongside of this apparent prosperity there has grown a wave of discontent more extensive than any known in previous years. Magazine after magazine has found itself unable to exist unless it fell into line with some form of radicalism, while every new periodical publication has sought to out-radical its previous competitors. It has not been simply the exposures which were such a striking characteristic of last year that have occupied public attention. There has been a distinct attempt to skate as close to socialism as possible without breaking through. The names that have led in the announcements of the magazines have been those of well-known socialists.

All this leads us to see that the past year has been pre-eminently a year of disintegration. The old bulwarks of capitalism, the old established public opinion, the orthodox psychology, on which has been based the thought of the people for the past twenty years, seem to have lost their power. So far has this gone that it is difficult to find any one so poor as to do honor to the ideals which ten years ago were taken for granted on every hand. It is these ideals which form the foundation of the defense of capitalism. When they are once broken up the mental attitude which results is one which forms the most favorable possible ground for the sowing of revolutionary seed. It was no more than natural that this stage should become so dominant in the mental life of the country as apparently to over-

shadow for the moment the purely socialist thought, and this will account for the apparent falling off in the socialist vote.

Yet this work of preparation had to be done and it has been done most thoroughly during the year past. The most gratifying aspect of the purely socialist propaganda is to be found in the steady increase of socialist literature. At the present time the United States leads the world, with the possible exception of Russia, in the output of new works and translations on socialism. The solid educational basis which this is laying for propaganda is the best possible security for steady, rapid progress in the near future.

The basis of all this movement lies, of course, in the industrial conditions. These industrial conditions are in themselves striking. Their most evident aspect is the "prosperity" previously mentioned. This, however, is but the superficial side of the question. Never in the history of the world has there been such rapid concentration of industry, such a rapid absorption of capital into ever fewer and fewer hands. The rise of Harriman, with the Rockefeller interests behind him, in the railroad world makes him for the moment the most prominent figure in industrial life. So far has concentration in this direction now gone that not more than half a dozen men control the trade arteries of America. In manufacturing and commercial lines the concentration has been only a little less rapid. We do not hear the startling tales of new trusts that filled the papers a few years ago. That we do not is but one of the signs that we have entered a new and more intense stage of concentration. It is not now a question of combining competing plants but of absorption by a few great financial systems of the entire industrial life of the nation. For the moment many little capitalists have been able to gain a foothold. Owing to the rapidly rising prices, they were able to live and even to prosper without attracting the attention of the powerful overlords of industry. But when the time shall come, which cannot now be far away, when an industrial reaction shall be among us, these little exploiters will be scraped off, as barnacles are scraped from the hulk of the ship in dry dock.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

The past year must go down in history as one of the beginnings of revolutions throughout a large portion of Europe. In England it has seen the justification of the Marxian position in the classic land of Fabianism. A strong class-organized labor party has fought its way into parliament and has accomplished more in a few months than all the years of Fabian agitation. The struggle over the education bill now threatens at last to wipe out the House of Lords and perhaps to bring about a dissolution of parliament. Such a dissolution can only mean the return of a larger labor party to parliament and a more rapid progress of the evolution.

In Germany things have been brought to a sudden climax by the dissolution of the Reichstag. The year has seen a steady strengthening of the organization of the Social Democratic Party and a clearing up of the relations between the party and the trade unions. This trade union question, by the way, is one which is today engaging the attention of practically every socialist party in Europe. The dissolution of the Reichstag was brought about on the question of the colonial policy. Comrade Bebel's scathing attack of the South African colonial administration opened the fight. The powerful Center party followed the dictates of its pocket book rather than its principles and fought against the increased taxation which the colonial policy would require. This brought about the defeat of the government measures and led to the dissolution of the Reichstag. The presiding officer has declared that he is serving his last term and that comrade Singer will take his place in the next Reichstag. This is not probable, even though the socialists should gain still further in strength, as it is practically certain that the emperor would not permit the existence of the reichstag presided over by a socialist.

In France the struggle between the church and the state is a direct culmination of the socialist movement. For years the church in France has been far less of a religious than a political organization. It has sought not simply to prevent progress but to secure the victory of reaction and the overthrow of the republic. In this endeavor they have brought about their own defeat and have been deprived of special privileges which they might otherwise probably have enjoyed undisturbed for many years. The law, against which so fierce an attack is now being waged by the clericals, simply provides that the churches shall be treated like any other associations. The majority of the Catholic membership were willing to accept the law, but the Vatican, feeling that its political power might thereby be diminished, attempted to incite its followers to rebellion. The result has been a dismal failure. The government has stood firm and the Catholic rank and file have refused to rise.

Meanwhile over all France hangs the fear that the Russian debt will be repudiated. This debt, which has been placed through the Credit Lyonnaise, the great Jesuit banking firm, is held largely by the clerical peasantry, and if it should be repudiated the hold of the Clericals on France will be still further weakened.

The long struggle for universal suffrage in Austria has at last been crowned with victory. The fight for this, which has been carried on by demonstrations, by street fighting, by agitation of every possible form, has been one of the most remarkable in the annals of the proletarian struggle for liberty. The immediate result of this cannot but be a large increase in the socialist representation in the Austrian Parliament.

In Denmark the "Social Demokraten," which is the leading daily paper in Denmark, having three times the circulation of its next largest capitalist competitor, declares that the socialists may capture parliament at the elections in 1908. This expectation is born out by the large increase in socialist representation in the municipal bodies which has followed every election held during the last year.

The Italian situation has been so well covered in these pages that there is little need to discuss it here. The Italian movement would seem to be in a state of reorganization which will almost certainly end in the strengthening of forces after a temporary weakness.

DENMARK.

The growth of socialist votes in the elections for Folkething as shown in a recent publication of the Danish Statistical Bureau is as follows:

1895.....	24,439.
1898.....	31,880.
1901.....	43,153.
1903.....	57,578.
1906.....	76,612.

GERMANY.

The German socialists have welcomed the dissolution of the Reichstag and have set forth their program of action for the coming campaign. They demand the introduction of a progressive income tax, exempting all incomes below 5,000 marks; they demand the restriction of the colonial policy and the giving up of the attempt of Germany to become a world power; they insist upon the reduction of the tax on food and set forth an elaborate program of labor legislation, including the fixing of a minimum labor day, protection for home workers, etc.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

As the readers of the Review are doubtless aware, the American Federation of Labor now has a declaration of political principles and platform of immediate demands, which were adopted at the recent Minneapolis convention unanimously and without much discussion. Nobody paid much attention to the committee report as read, least of all some of the reactionists, and when the declaration was printed it is doubtful whether one person in a thousand read or studied it. But upon close examination it will be discovered that there is a "joker" in the preamble, which the reactionists either did not see or did not understand if they did see it. The declaration goes on to proclaim that "we are in close relation with other reform bodies and with them agree that not only should the burden of toil be made lighter, but that **each worker has an undeniable right to enjoy the full benefit of all he or she produces.**" If any delegate known to believe in socialism had stood on the floor and offered the same sentence for adoption in the form of a resolution the little cæsar on the platform and his clacquers would have dangled the poor old skeleton of deleonism before the public for fare you well. The justice of the declaration would have been entirely forgotten in the bear garden performance as Gompers and his lieutenants would relate in detail how they had been "abused" by some Socialist newspaper or soap-box orator. The slightest criticism of these infallible gentry is magnified into slander and villification of the most unpardonable sort. They holler at the Socialists by the hour, but never go into the merits or demerits of socialism. The nearest that Gompers ever came to a discussion of the fundamental principle of socialism and affording an intellectual treat to a mighty nation was at the Boston convention when he loftily waved his hand and declared impressively: "Economically you are unsound; politically you are an impossibility." That brought out the clacque in a manner that made the Socialists shrink into nothingness. The world's movement was done for; the oracle had spoken. The National Civic Federation Review was so tickled with the profound pronunciamiento that it printed a new halftone of the redoubtable Samuel and labeled him "Socialism's Ablest Foe." Scores of capitalistic dailies have commented at length upon the remarkable ability of Gompers in "smashing socialism," and there are thousands of anti-Socialists in the country who actually believe that they have a great champion in the president of the A. F. of L. Yet Gompers has never made a speech against socialism, and I don't believe that he can. There are a good many Socialists in this land who would travel quite a few miles to hear Mr. Gompers make a set speech against socialism. It is reported that some of the labor mass meetings that Mr.

Gompers addresses are very slimly attended. Let him advertise the fact that he will expose the "unsoundness" of socialism. It's a ten to one shot that he will draw crowds wherever we goes.

But to return to the Federation's political declaration. How will this manifesto "jibe" with the declared intention of the leaders to continue to punish our friends and reward our enemies? Certainly the Republican and Democratic parties and their candidates for office will not subscribe to the principle that "each worker has an undeniable right to enjoy the full benefit of all he or she produces," for to concede that right would mean the end of the system that fattens them. They will not even stand for municipal ownership of public utilities, nationalization of telegraphs and telephones, initiative and referendum, imperative mandate, government issuance of money and other reforms contained in the platform. Still the punishing and rewarding business, and probable confusion and internal dissension, is now the thing to demonstrate the "soundness" and "possibility" of the Gompsonian tactics. The preamble and platform was merely adopted to look at, not to stand upon as far as the so-called leaders are concerned. Nevertheless the inclusion of a socialistic truth, even though hidden by a lot of reactionary junk, may attract the attention of some of the rank and file and encourage an agitation and ultimate action along right lines. Whoever was the author of the sane declaration quoted above deserves considerable credit for steering it over hostile shoals. It also indicates that there is an enemy in the Gompers camp.

One of the most bitter and disastrous jurisdiction controversies between two international labor organizations is about to be settled. For some years the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners and the Amalgamated Woodworkers' Union have been waging war over the question of controlling the mill hands. The latter are the successors of the old-fashioned woodworkers, who were skilled handicraftsmen. The modern woodworker simply runs a machine, and also manufactures much of the material required in the erection of buildings, such as framework, windows, doors, etc., and thus takes employment away from the carpenter, who was wont to do all this work on the job. Naturally the mill worker soon became the bone of contention and both organizations struggled for control. Quite a few strikes and boycotts were declared against concerns that were innocent of any wrongdoing but employed members of one or the other union. It has finally dawned upon some of the officials and members of the organizations that their internecine strife was suicidal, and that more good could be accomplished by dwelling together in peace and harmony. Therefore, the present year will see the amalgamation of both organizations. The combined membership will be upward of 200,000 men, and it is hoped to speedily add to this number at least 50,000 mill workers, who have been holding aloof from both bodies while the quarrel was in progress. The principle of industrialism will receive strong endorsement by the amalgamation.

The brewery workers, as predicted in the Review, will not accept the edict of the Minneapolis convention of the A. F. of L. to dismember themselves by letting go of the engineers, firemen, teamsters, etc., employed in and about breweries. The official organ of the brewery workers has uttered a defiance to the Federation command, pointing out that so long as the United Mine Workers, the International Longshoremen, Marine and Transport Workers' Association and other organizations are permitted to combine on industrial lines the brewers do not intend to be plucked to pieces, but in-

stead will continue to put forth every effort to organize all the workmen over whom they are granted jurisdiction in their charter rights. It is a remarkable inconsistency that a convention can unblushingly smile upon the miners and longshoremen; recommend that the carpenters and woodworkers amalgamate and then turn about with a frown and demand of the brewery workers that they disintegrate. It is this sort of farcical freakishness that causes thoughtful people to wonder whether certain so-called leaders will ever grow big enough to get over their childish prejudices, for there is no use in attempting to conceal the fact that the brewery workers are the victims of a narrow-minded cabal in the Federation and are hated because they are, industrially and politically, one of the most progressive organizations in the land. If the brewers stand true to their union they need have nothing to fear, even if they are fired from the Federation by their seemingly uncompromising enemies.

The strike of the railway firemen on the Southern Pacific came as a natural outgrowth of the peculiar jurisdiction tangle that has developed in the railway cab. The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, as a matter of course, claim that they should have the sole voice in regulating affairs that affect their trade, which position looks reasonable enough. But along comes the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and declares that it should not be required to transfer its members to the B. of L. E., and those members should not lose their insurance and other benefits in the B. of L. F. when they are promoted. In other words, there are hundreds of engineers in the B. of L. F. who were formerly firemen, and they will not transfer their membership because it would mean considerable financial loss and hardship. Consequently the B. of L. F. claims the right to demand recognition for the engineers in its ranks. Last year, on account of this contention, a clash came on the New York, New Haven & Hartford railway, and last month the struggle broke out on the Southern Pacific. The quarrel has also caused more or less friction on other lines. In nearly every instance the railway magnates have taken sides with the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and this fact has only served to embitter the firemen and some of the other brotherhoods that sympathize with them. The fight between these rival organizations will be fought to a finish sooner or later unless a compromise is arranged in the form of an industrial organization. Meanwhile the railway magnates are not losing much where one brotherhood scabs it on the other.

During the past few months many railroads and other corporations have made slight increases in wages. Some of the concerns, like the Standard Oil Co., took particular pains to announce that the advance would be given to all workers except those who were members of unions, and thus, in so many words, placed a premium on open shoppery. In other cases the widely advertised raise of wages had a string attached to them, as, for example, the Pennsylvania railroad's 10 per cent advance. That corporation laid off hundreds of men and permitted those who were retained to do a little harder and more work for the additional money they received. It is stated that most of the men who were discharged were on the shady side of forty, and, as the Pennsylvania has a pension roll for employees who reach the age of sixty, those who were decapitated would not become a burden to the corporation later on. Throughout this so-called wave of prosperity there has been one thing quite noticeable, and that is the manner in which the newspapers—not the Socialist and labor press alone, but many dailies as well—have printed the latest statistics relating to the cost of living, increased prices of ne-

cessities, etc., and almost without exception they showed that we, the working people, are considerable behind in the new deal — that prices have advanced more rapidly than wages, and, therefore, we have been hornswoggled. All of which goes to show that the labor question will not be settled by industrial action, but politically, and not through the old parties now in control, but only through the program of the Socialist party.

BOOK REVIEWS

What's So and What Isn't, by John M. Work. Third edition, revised and enlarged. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, Cloth, 156 pages, 50c.

This is pre-eminently a book to hand a man who is beginning to discuss with himself the question of whether he is a socialist. It fills a field all of its own. It does not pretend to be a discussion of principles, neither is it simply a work to arouse interest, although it will certainly do this.

It does, however, take up every possible objection that can be raised to socialism and argues in such an entertaining and instructive manner that when the reader has finished he finds himself without a leg to stand on. So quotable is the book that it has already proved to be the best friend of a majority of the socialist editors. You can tear a page out of it almost anywhere and have an excellent treatment of some one phase of socialist thought. Its short, snappy style, direct assertive manner and clear statement of positions makes it so easily intelligible that the reader would have to be running very fast indeed not to understand.

Social and Philosophical Studies, by Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, Cloth, 165 pages, 50c.

Lafargue has long been recognized as one of the most scholarly and also interesting writers of the international socialist movement. These essays contain some of the best work he has ever done. There are four of them: the first on the "Causes of the Belief in God" and the other three, respectively on the "Origin of Abstract Ideas" "Justice" and the "Good".

Throughout his standpoint is that of the comparative evolutionary writer and his wide reading and thorough scholarship enable him to apply this method in its most effective form. Whether the reader agrees with him or not he cannot but find the mass of facts which are assembled available in throwing light upon the subject treated.

A portion of the first essay appeared in a previous number of the Review and this will serve to give an idea of the style and method of treatment. In taking up the origin of abstract ideas he begins with the Greek philosophers and takes up the different ideas which have come to be considered as fundamental in all intuitive ethics. These ideas are traced through the Middle Ages and the bourgeois revolution until the time of Darwin. Here the whole

train of thought is altered by the rise of evolutionary physiological psychology. All of these ideas are summed up in his final chapter on "The Bourgeois Moral Ideal," which he concludes as follows:

"Language has revealed to us that the barbarians, by their habitual anthropomorphic way of proceeding, had incorporated their moral virtues into material goods. But the economic phenomena and the political events which prepared the ground for the mode of production and exchange of the bourgeoisie, dissolved the primitive union of the moral and the material. The barbarian did not blush for this union, since it was the physical and moral qualities of which he was the proudest which were set in action for the conquest and the preservation of material goods. The bourgeois, on the contrary, is ashamed of the low virtues which he is forced to put in play to arrive at his fortune, so he wishes to make believe, and he ends by believing, that his soul wanders above matter and feeds on eternal truths and immutable principles; but language, the incorrigible tell-tale, unveils to us that under the thick clouds of the most purified ethics hides the sovereign idol of the capitalists, the Good, the Property-god."

The Pattern Nation, by Sir Henry Wrixon. MacMillan & Co., Cloth, 172 p., \$1.00.

"The question now is, not what the rich will do with the poor, but what the poor will do with the rich. * * * This domination of the wage-earners will be the great fact of our age." To the author this outlook is one to be feared and regretted. He shows a far better understanding of the basic principles of socialism than the majority of its opponents, and this makes him really worth reading. He sees the steady growth of class-consciousness among the workers and recognizes that they will soon have their own "public opinion." Instead of parroting the old falsehood that appears in most anti-socialist works about the various kinds of socialism he says: "The new movement can certainly lay claim to not only the enthusiasm of a religion, but a unity of belief in its followers. Its spokesmen are busy propagating their faith throughout the nations of the West; but amid all the differences of nationality, they speak with one voice in the condemnation which they pronounce upon our present system of life and industry, and in describing the revolution which they hope to bring about."

Yet to him the victory of socialism will but be the "Coming Slavery" of Herbert Spencer in whose deadening grip all incentive to progress will be lost until "Even drowsy China would have greater freedom of life and scope for the individuality than would then be left to the peoples of the West."

He is not wholly to blame for the misunderstanding upon which his argument in this direction rests. He has derived his idea of socialism largely from the works of such thoroughly bourgeois reformers as the Webbs, H. G. Wells, and the other English municipal and national reformers, to whom State owned industry is synonymous with socialism.

He advises as a way out of this evolution the development of co-operation and profit sharing until ultimately he seems to have in mind the attainment of a co-operatively owned and managed industry not so different from that aimed at by the Socialist. The only point of difference would be in the method of the evolution.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

"THE PUBLIC SERVICE."

The large number of letters received by Maurice E. Eldridge in response to his article "The Military Power," which appeared in the International Socialist Review for December, prompted him to undertake the publication of a new magazine, The Public Service, as the initial move in the plans upon which he had been working. The subscription price is twenty-five cents a year, and each subscription will make it possible to send several copies each month to the soldiers. Address Maurice E. Eldridge, Publisher, 264 E. Kinzie Street, Chicago.

LABRIOLA'S SOCIALISM AND PHILOSOPHY.

After unexpected and unavoidable delays, this valuable work by the author of "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History" is now ready. It is in the form of personal letters and it deals with questions vital to the socialist movement, so that every active socialist who cares for more than a superficial understanding of socialism will find the book full of interest. The translation has been made direct from the original Italian by Ernest Untermann. There is also an appendix by the translator in which he contrasts the historical materialism of Antonio Labriola with the materialist monism of Joseph Dietzgen. It is a highly suggestive essay and no one wishing to keep abreast of socialist thought can afford to miss it. (Cloth, \$1.00.)

THE RISE OF THE AMERICAN PROLETARIAN.

This work by Austin Lewis, briefly announced in last month's Review, is nearly ready for the press, and should be ready about the last of this month. It is a graphic interpretation of American history from Columbus to Roosevelt. The author does not repeat the bare facts of history, but explains familiar facts in the light of socialist principles, with a keen logic and incisive style that will delight the socialist and stagger the conservative. This is one of the books that will be read for the pleasure of it rather than from a

sense of duty. It is full of ammunition for the speaker, and it is one of the best possible books for a new inquirer. (Cloth, \$1.00.)

THINGS DONE IN 1906.

We began the year with not quite twelve hundred stockholders united in our co-operative publishing house. We close the year with sixteen hundred. This means an addition to our capital of four thousand dollars, and our co-operators may fairly expect us to show a corresponding increase in the publications of the house. Here is the showing:

We have issued twelve volumes in the International Library of Social Science, retailing at \$1.00 each.

Five volumes in the Standard Socialist Series, retailing at 50c.

Three volumes in the Library of Science for the Workers, retailing at 50c.

The first volume of a complete American edition of Marx's "Capital," retail price \$2.00.

"The Rebel at Large," a volume of socialist stories by May Beals, retail price 50c.

The average edition of all these books exceeded 1,000 copies, but figuring it at this, the total retail prices of the new books issued by us in 1906 amount to \$18,500. This does not include the reprints of other books, nor the pamphlets. We issued 75,000 copies of a single pamphlet, "What to Read on Socialism," 25,000 copies of "Confessions of a Drone," and large editions of many other booklets.

The earnings of the publishing house have paid all expenses and its resources are far in excess of what they were a year ago.

THE OUTLOOK FOR 1907.

But we have scarcely made a beginning at the work which is urgently needed. There are at least 400,000 socialist voters in the United States who would talk in a way to make more socialist votes if they only had the right books to equip them to talk convincingly. And there are millions of other voters who would study socialism for themselves if socialist books were brought to their notice.

No publishing house but ours is making any serious attempt to put the best books of International Socialism within the reach of these voters. To enlarge our work we need more capital and need it now. Here are some of the books already printing that we need it for:

Class Struggles in America. By A. M. Simons. Third edition, revised and enlarged, with notes and references. (Standard Socialist Series, Vol. 18, 50c.)

Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History. By Karl

Kautsky, translated by John B. Askew. (Standard Socialist Series, Vol. 17, 50c.)

Marxian Economics. By Ernest Untermann. (International Library of Social Science, Vol. 13, \$1.00.)

The Rise of the American Proletarian. By Austin Lewis. (International Library of Social Science, Vol. 14, \$1.00.)

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx. By Louis B. Boudin. (International Library of Social Science, Vol. 15, \$1.00.)

Landmarks of Scientific Socialism (Anti-Duehring). By Frederick Engels, translated by Austin Lewis. (International Library of Social Science, Vol. 16, \$1.00.)

Ancient Society; or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress; from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization. By Lewis H. Morgan, LL.D. Cloth, \$1.50.

The Ancient Lowly: A History of the Ancient Working People, from the Earliest Known Period to the Adoption of Christianity by Constantine. By C. Osborne Ward. Cloth, two large volumes, \$4.00. Either volume sold separately at \$2.00.

Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Volume II, The Process of Capitalist Circulation. By Karl Marx, translated by Ernest Untermann. Cloth, \$2.00.

HOW THE MONEY CAN BE RAISED.

To publish these books will cost five thousand dollars, and it will all be needed in the next few weeks. No capitalist is backing this publishing house; it depends for its support on the socialists who want the books it publishes. If you are one of them, you will want to do your share.

If you are not already a stockholder the first thing to do is to become one. It costs ten dollars; we prefer to have you send the full amount in one remittance, but if this is not convenient, you can pay a dollar a month for ten months. As soon as you have paid your first dollar, you have the privilege of buying our books at half price if they are sent at your expense, or at forty per cent discount if sent by mail or express prepaid.

If you are a stockholder, there are three things to do. One is to find other stockholders. We do not ask you to buy more shares; the stock draws no dividends, and you get books at the lowest possible price by subscribing for one share. We want the stock held by as many different socialists as possible. Every new stockholder makes the publishing house stronger.

A second way to help is by buying books, either for yourself or for others. We prefer that you charge others the full retail price,

and use the profit to buy books to lend or give to those unable to buy.

The third way to help is to lend money. Our ordinary receipts average nearly a hundred dollars a day, and we are in a position to return all loans for a hundred dollars or less on demand without notice, though we prefer to have notice when convenient. We will when desired pay four per cent interest on loans made with the understanding that we shall have thirty days' notice before the money is withdrawn. We do not offer high interest rates because the publishing house is not run to earn profits but to circulate the greatest possible amount of the best socialist literature at the lowest possible prices. It is probable that the new stock subscriptions received during 1907 will make loans unnecessary after this year, but meanwhile they will enable us to hasten the publication of important books that might otherwise be delayed.

FINANCIAL REPORT FOR NOVEMBER.

The book sales for the month of December were \$1,765.00, the receipts of the Review \$350.95, and the sales of stock \$349.15. This last item is not gratifying. There are probably two thousand readers of the Review who have a half-formed intention to subscribe for stock some time. They realize the need of publishing more socialist books, yet they seem entirely willing to wait and let some one else provide the necessary capital. The receipts of the Review are encouraging, since they are considerably more than the expenses of the Review for a month; it should be remembered however that more subscriptions expire with the December issue than with any other, and that a considerable addition to the list of subscribers is still necessary to put the magazine on a safely self-supporting basis. But there is real encouragement in the sum total of the book sales. The cost of replacing the books sold for \$1,765.00 can not be exactly determined since there is a slight variation in the cost of each book, but it can not exceed \$600, leaving nearly \$1,200 available for general expenses and for the plates of new books. These general expenses are to a large extent fixed, and will not be greatly increased with increasing book sales. Even on the present basis there is a margin of some \$300 above all expenses to apply on the plates of new books, and with the increased sales that 1907 is likely to bring there should be several thousand dollars available during the year from this source for the making of new books. But the first need is the ready money to print the new books that are already secured, and here is where we need new stock subscriptions and need them now.

SPECIAL CASH OFFERS FOR JANUARY ONLY.

A share of stock, par value ten dollars, gives you for the whole existence of the publishing house the right to buy its publications

at cost: for the year 1907 the cost price to stockholders is figured at a discount of one half from retail prices when purchaser pays expressage, or forty per cent if we pay postage or expressage. During January we offer:

For \$10.00 cash with order, a share of stock and any books published by us to the amount of \$5.00 at retail prices. (If you wish us to prepay charges, add 50c.)

For \$12.00 cash with order, a share of stock and books to the amount of \$10.00 at retail prices. Expressage if prepaid by us \$1.00 extra.

For \$14.00 cash with order, a share of stock and books to the amount of \$20.00 at retail prices. Expressage if prepaid by us \$1.75 extra.

For \$20.00 cash with order a share of stock and books to the amount of 40.00 at retail prices. Expressage if prepaid by us \$3.50 extra, boxing and cartage if sent by freight \$1.00 extra.

These offers do not apply to books imported by us and listed on page 34 of the November edition of "What to Read on Socialism," but only to our own publications. They are made for the special purpose of raising without borrowing the money that is now urgently needed for bringing out new books, and at the same time of securing new stockholders who will become regular book-buyers. The offers do NOT apply to those who have already subscribed for stock.

If you want socialist books, either for yourself or to sell to others, here is a chance to get them that will never present itself again. And if you want to see more socialist books circulated, here is the place where your ten dollars will count in the most effective way possible. Send today; you might forget tomorrow and after January it will be too late to come in on these offers. Address

**CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY (CO-OPERATIVE),
264 East Kinzie Street, Chicago.**